arXiv:1704.02668v1 [math.NT] 9 Apr 2017

The average size of the kernel of a matrix and orbits of linear groups

Tobias Rossmann

Department of Mathematics, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be a compact discrete valuation ring of characteristic zero. Given a module M of matrices over $\mathfrak{O}$, we study the generating function encoding the average sizes of the kernels of the elements of M over finite quotients of $\mathfrak{O}$. We prove rationality and establish fundamental properties of these generating functions and determine them explicitly for various natural families of modules M. Using p-adic Lie theory, we then show that special cases of these generating functions enumerate orbits and conjugacy classes of suitable linear p-groups.

Contents

1 Introduction 1
2 Elementary properties of average sizes of kernels 6
3 Basic algebraic and analytic properties of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and $\zeta_M(s)$ 8
4 Rationality of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and p-adic integration 11
5 Full matrix algebras, classical Lie algebras, and relatives 18
6 Constant rank spaces 23
7 Orbits and conjugacy classes of linear groups 26
8 Further examples 31

1 Introduction

This article is devoted to certain generating functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ ("ask zeta functions") attached to modules M of matrices over compact discrete valuation rings. The coefficients of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ encode the average sizes of the kernels of the elements of M over finite quotients

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 15B33, 15B52, 05A15, 11M41, 11S80, 20D60, 20D15, 20E45
Keywords. Random matrices, average size of a kernel, p-adic integration, orbits of linear groups, conjugacy classes, finite p-groups, pro-p groups, unipotent groups, matrix Lie algebras

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation in the form of a Feodor Lynen Research Fellowship.

of the base ring. Prior to formally defining these functions and stating our main results, we briefly indicate how our study of the functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ is motivated by questions from (both finite and infinite) group theory and probabilistic linear algebra.

Conjugacy classes of finite groups. Given a finite group G, let $\mathrm{k}(G)$ denote the number of its conjugacy classes. It is well-known that $\mathrm{k}(G)$ coincides with the number of the (ordinary) irreducible characters of G. Let $\mathrm{U}_d \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d$ be the group scheme of upper unitriangular $d \times d$ matrices. Raised as a question in [36], "Higman's conjecture" asserts that $\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{U}_d(\mathbf{F}_q))$ is given by a polynomial in q for each fixed $d \geqslant 1$.

Numerous people have contributed to confirming Higman's conjecture for small d. In particular, building on a long series of papers, Vera-López and Arregi [65] established Higman's conjecture for $d \leqslant 13$. Using a different approach, Pak and Soffer [54] recently provided a confirmation for $d \leqslant 16$. While Higman's conjecture remains open in general and despite some evidence suggesting that it may fail to hold for large d (see [54]), it nonetheless influenced and inspired numerous results on related questions; see, in particular, work of Isaacs [40, 41] on character degrees of so-called algebra groups and work of Goodwin and Röhrle [32–35] on conjugacy classes of unipotent elements in groups of Lie type.

Orbits of linear groups. All rings in this article are assumed to be commutative and unital. Let R be a ring and let V be an R-module with $|V| < \infty$. Given a linear group $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}(V)$, it is a classical problem (for $R = \mathbf{F}_q$) to relate arithmetic properties of the number of orbits of G on its natural module V to geometric and group-theoretic properties of G; see e.g. [29] and the references therein. This problem is closely related to the enumeration of irreducible characters (and hence of conjugacy classes). In particular, if G is a finite p-group of nilpotency class less than p, then the Kirillov orbit method establishes a bijection between the ordinary irreducible characters of G and the coadjoint orbits of G on the dual of its associated Lie ring; cf. [31] and see [53] for applications of such techniques to enumerative problems.

Rank distributions and the average size of a kernel. In addition to group-theoretic problems such as those indicated above, this article is also inspired by questions and results from probabilistic linear algebra. For an elementary example, to the author's knowledge, the number

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^e - q^i) \frac{q^{d-i} - 1}{q^{i+1} - 1}.$$

of $d \times e$ matrices of rank r with entries in a finite field $\mathbf{F}_q$ was first recorded by Landsberg [47]. More recently, probabilistic questions surrounding the distribution of ranks in sets of matrices over finite fields have been studied, see e.g. [3, 6, 13, 25] and [46, Ch. 3]; for applications, see [49, 63].

Let R be a ring, let V and W be R-modules with $|V|, |W| < \infty$, and let $M \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V, W)$ be a submodule. In the following, we are primarily interested in the case that R is finite

and $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(R)$ acts by right-multiplication on $V = R^d$. The average size of the kernel of the elements of M is

$$\mathrm{ask}(M) := \mathrm{ask}(M \mid V) := |M|^{-1} \sum_{a\in M} |\mathrm{Ker}(a)|.$$

Linial and Weitz [50] gave the following formula for $\mathrm{ask}(\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathbf{F}_q))$; the same result appeared (with a different proof) in a recent paper by Fulman and Goldstein [28, Lem. 3.2] which also contains further examples of $\mathrm{ask}(M)$.

Proposition 1.1. $\mathrm{ask}(\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathbf{F}_q)) = 1 + q^{d-e} - q^{-e}$.

As we will see later, for a linear p-group $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}(V)$ with a sufficiently strong Lie theory, $|V/G|$ and $\mathrm{k}(G)$ are both instances of $\mathrm{ask}(\mathfrak{g})$ for suitable linear Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}$.

Orbit-counting and conjugacy class zeta functions. In the literature, numbers of the form $|V/G|$, $\mathrm{k}(G)$, and $\mathrm{ask}(M \mid V)$ for R-modules V and W, a linear group $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}(V)$, and $M \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V, W)$ were primarily studied in the case that $R = \mathbf{F}_q$ is a finite field. Instead of individual numbers, we consider families of such numbers obtained by replacing $\mathbf{F}_q$ by the finite quotients of suitable rings.

We will use the following notation throughout this article. Let K be a non-Archimedean local field and let $\mathfrak{O}$ be its valuation ring—equivalently, $\mathfrak{O}$ is a compact discrete valuation ring with field of fractions K; we occasionally write $\mathfrak{O}_K$ instead of $\mathfrak{O}$ and similarly below. For example, K could be the field $\mathbf{Q}_p$ of p-adic numbers (in which case $\mathfrak{O} = \mathbf{Z}_p$ is the ring of p-adic integers) or the field $\mathbf{F}_q(\!(t)\!)$ of formal Laurent series over $\mathbf{F}_q$ (in which case $\mathfrak{O} = \mathbf{F}_q[\![t]\!]$). Let $\mathfrak{P}$ denote the maximal ideal of $\mathfrak{O}$. Let $\mathfrak{K} := \mathfrak{O}/\mathfrak{P}$ be the residue field of K and let q and p denote the size and characteristic of $\mathfrak{K}$, respectively. We write $\mathfrak{P}^n = \mathfrak{P} \cdots \mathfrak{P}$ for the nth ideal power of $\mathfrak{P}$; on the other hand, $\mathfrak{O}^n = \mathfrak{O} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{O}$ denotes the nth Cartesian power of $\mathfrak{O}$. Let $\mathfrak{O}_n = \mathfrak{O}/\mathfrak{P}^n$ and $\mathfrak{O}_\infty = \mathfrak{O}$.

Definition 1.2. Let $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ be a subgroup.

(i) Let $G_n \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O}_n)$ denote the image of G under the natural map $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O}_n)$. The **conjugacy class zeta function** of G is $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_G(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{k}(G_n)T^n$.

(ii) The **orbit-counting zeta function** of G is $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_G(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\mathfrak{O}_n^d/G|T^n$.

The study of these generating functions usually involves the Dirichlet series $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_G(q^{-s})$ and $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_G(q^{-s})$ which justifies calling them "zeta functions". Conjugacy class zeta functions were introduced by du Sautoy [22] who established their rationality for $\mathfrak{O} = \mathbf{Z}_p$. Berman et al. [5] investigated $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$ for Chevalley groups G. Special cases of the functions $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_G(T)$ have previously appeared in the literature. In particular, Avni et al. [2, Thm E] determined orbit-counting zeta functions associated with the coadjoint representations of GL_3 and group schemes of the form GU_3.

Conjugacy class and orbit-counting zeta functions are natural analogues of the numbers of conjugacy classes and orbits of finite groups from above. For example, it is a natural generalisation of Higman's conjecture to ask, for each fixed d, whether $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathrm{U}_d(\mathfrak{O}_K)}(T)$ is given by a rational function in q_K and T as a function of K.

The definition of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$. We now introduce the protagonist of this article. Let V and W be finitely generated $\mathfrak{O}$-modules. We frequently write $V_n = V \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$ and $W_n = W \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$, where, in the absence of subscripts, tensor products are always taken over $\mathfrak{O}$. Given a submodule $M \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V, W)$, we let M_n denote the image of M under the natural map $\mathrm{Hom}(V, W) \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_n, W_n)$, $a \mapsto a \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\mathfrak{O}_n}$; we note that the natural surjection $M \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n \twoheadrightarrow M_n$ need not be an isomorphism. Hence, for a submodule $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$, we obtain $M_n \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O}_n)$ by reducing the entries of all matrices in M modulo $\mathfrak{P}^n$. This article is devoted to generating functions of the following form.

Definition 1.3. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule and $V = \mathfrak{O}^d$. Define the **ask zeta function** of M to be

$$\mathsf{Z}_M(T) := \mathsf{Z}_{M \curvearrowright V}(T) := \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_M(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{ask}(M_n \mid V_n) T^n \in \mathbf{Q}[\![T]\!].$$

In contrast to the probabilistic flavour of the work on the numbers $\mathrm{ask}(M \mid V)$ cited above, our investigations of the functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ draw upon results and techniques that have been previously applied in asymptotic group theory and, specifically, the theory of zeta functions (representation zeta functions, in particular) of groups and other algebraic structures; for recent surveys of this area, see [45, 68, 69].

Results I: fundamental properties and examples of ask zeta functions. Our central structural result on the functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ is the following.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field of characteristic zero. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule. Then $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ is rational, i.e. $\mathsf{Z}_M(T) \in \mathbf{Q}(T)$.*

For example, $\mathsf{Z}_{\{0_{d\times e}\}}(T) = 1/(1 - q^d T)$. At the other extreme, we will obtain the following generalisation of Proposition 1.1.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field of arbitrary characteristic. Let q be the residue field size of $\mathfrak{O}$. Then*

$$\mathsf{Z}_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{1 - q^{-e}T}{(1-T)(1-q^{d-e}T)}. \tag{1.1}$$

Note that since $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = 1 + (1 + q^{d-e} - q^{-e})T + \mathcal{O}(T^2)$, Proposition 1.5 indeed generalises Proposition 1.1. Apart from proving Proposition 1.5, in §5, we will also determine $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ for traceless (Corollary 5.8), symmetric (Proposition 5.11), anti-symmetric (Proposition 5.9), upper triangular (Proposition 5.13), and diagonal (Corollary 5.15) matrices. We will also explain why many of our formulae are of the same shape as (1.1).

Our proofs of Theorem 1.4, Proposition 1.5, and various other results in this article rest upon expressing the functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ in terms of p-adic integrals (Theorem 4.5). These integrals can then be studied using powerful techniques developed over the past decades, primarily in the context of Igusa's local zeta function (see [17, 38] for introductions). Our use of these techniques is similar to and inspired by their applications in the theory of zeta functions of groups, primarily in the study of representation growth (see [1, 42, 61, 67]). In particular, Theorem 1.4 follows from rationality results going back to Igusa and Denef. Using a theorem of Voll [67] we will furthermore see that the identity

$$\mathsf{Z}_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})}(T)\Big|_{(q,T)\to(q^{-1},T^{-1})} = (-q^dT)\cdot \mathsf{Z}_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$$

is no coincidence (Theorem 4.15). Our p-adic formalism is also compatible with our previous computational work (summarised in [57]) which allows us to explicitly compute numerous further examples of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$; see §8 for some of these.

While "random matrices" over local fields have been studied before (see e.g. [27]), the author is not aware of previous applications of the particular techniques employed (and the point of view taken) here.

Results II: ask zeta functions and asymptotic group theory. We say that a formal power series $F(T) \in \mathbf{Q}[\![T]\!]$ has **bounded denominators** if there exists a non-zero $a \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $aF(T) \in \mathbf{Z}[\![T]\!]$. As usual, for a ring R and R-module V, let $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ denote the Lie algebra associated with the associative algebra $\mathrm{End}(V)$; that is, $\mathfrak{gl}(V) = \mathrm{End}(V)$ as R-modules and the Lie bracket of $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ is defined in terms of multiplication in $\mathrm{End}(V)$ via $[a, b] = ab - ba$.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field of characteristic zero. Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ be a Lie subalgebra. Then $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T)$ has bounded denominators.*

Theorem 1.6 is based on a connection between $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and orbit-counting zeta functions. For a sketch, let $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ act on $V = \mathfrak{O}^d$. As before, we write $\mathfrak{O}_n = \mathfrak{O}/\mathfrak{P}^n$ and $V_n = V \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$. Then G acts on each of the finite sets V_n and, extending our previous definition of the orbit-counting zeta function $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_G(T)$ (Definition 1.2(ii)), we let

$$\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc},m}_G(T) = \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} |V_n/G| \cdot T^{n-m} \in \mathbf{Z}[\![T]\!];$$

hence, $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_G(T) := \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc},0}_G(T)$. In the setting of Theorem 1.6, by linearising the orbit-counting lemma using p-adic Lie theory, we will see that for sufficiently large m, there exists $G^m \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ with $q^{dm}\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc},m}_{G^m}(T)$. Theorem 1.6 then follows immediately.

In addition to using group theory to deduce properties of ask zeta functions such as Theorem 1.6, we will see that, conversely, our methods for studying ask zeta functions allow us to deduce results on both orbit-counting and conjugacy class zeta functions. As we will now sketch, this direction is particularly fruitful for unipotent groups. For a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over a ring R, let $\mathrm{ad}\colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})$ denote its adjoint representation given by

$\mathrm{ad}(a)\colon b \mapsto [b,a]$ for $a \in \mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathfrak{n}_d(R) \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d(R)$ denote the Lie algebra of strictly upper triangular $d \times d$ matrices.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a finite extension of the field $\mathbf{Q}_p$ of p-adic numbers. Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ be a Lie subalgebra and let $G := \exp(\mathfrak{g}) \leqslant \mathrm{U}_d(\mathfrak{O})$. Suppose that $p \geqslant d$ and that $\mathfrak{g}$ is an isolated submodule of $\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ (i.e. the $\mathfrak{O}$-module quotient $\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})/\mathfrak{g}$ is torsion-free). Then $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_G(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T)$ and $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_G(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g})}(T)$.*

For example, we may use Theorem 1.7 and the methods for computing $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ developed below in order to compute "generic" conjugacy class zeta functions arising from all unipotent algebraic groups of dimension at most 5 over a number field (see §8.3).

Outline. In §§2–§3, we collect elementary facts on $\mathrm{ask}(M \mid V)$ and $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$. We then derive expressions for $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ in terms of p-adic integrals in §4. In §5, we use these to compute explicit formulae for $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ for various modules M. Next, in §6, we discuss a relationship between the functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and "constant rank spaces" studied extensively in the literature. In §7, we explore the aforementioned connection between ask, conjugacy class, and orbit-counting zeta functions. In particular, we prove Theorems 1.6–1.7. Finally, given that most of the explicit formulae for $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ obtained in §§5–6 are quite tame, §8 contains a number of "wild" examples of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_G(T)$.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to Angela Carnevale for discussions leading to Corollary 5.15 and to Eamonn O'Brien and Christopher Voll for helpful comments and suggestions.

2 Elementary properties of average sizes of kernels

We collect some elementary observations on average sizes of kernels. Throughout, let R be a ring, let V and W be R-modules with $|V|, |W| < \infty$, and let $M \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V,W)$ be a submodule.

2.1 Rank varieties

In the case of a finite field $R = \mathbf{F}_q$, $\mathrm{ask}(M \mid V)$ admits a natural geometric interpretation. Namely, by choosing a basis of M, we may identify $M = \mathbf{A}^{\ell}_{\mathbf{F}_q}(\mathbf{F}_q)$, where $\ell = \dim_{\mathbf{F}_q}(M)$ and $\mathbf{A}^{\ell}_{\mathbf{F}_q} = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbf{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_\ell])$. We may then decompose $\mathbf{A}^{\ell}_{\mathbf{F}_q} = \coprod_{i=0}^{r} V_i$, where V_i is the subvariety of maps of rank i. Then $\mathrm{ask}(M \mid V) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} \#V_i(\mathbf{F}_q) \cdot q^{d-i-\ell}$; in fact, by replacing q by q^f on the right-hand side, we express $\mathrm{ask}(M \otimes_{\mathbf{F}_q} \mathbf{F}_{q^f} \mid V \otimes_{\mathbf{F}_q} \mathbf{F}_{q^f})$ using a formula which is valid for any $f \geqslant 1$. However, even for $M = \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathbf{F}_q)$, this approach yields a fairly complicated interpretation of Proposition 1.1.

2.2 Kernels and orbits

One simple yet crucial observation contained in the proof of [50, Thm 1.1] is the following connection between the sizes of the kernels $\mathrm{Ker}(a)$ ($a \in M$) and those of the "orbits" $\boldsymbol{x}M := \{\boldsymbol{x}a : a \in M\} \approx M/\,\mathrm{c}_M(\boldsymbol{x})$, where $\boldsymbol{x} \in V$ and $\mathrm{c}_M(\boldsymbol{x}) := \{a \in M : \boldsymbol{x}a = 0\}$; note that in contrast to orbits under group actions, the sets $\boldsymbol{x}M$ always overlap.

Lemma 2.1 (Cf. [50, Thm 1.1])**.** $\mathrm{ask}(M \mid V) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V} |\boldsymbol{x}M|^{-1}$.

We give two proofs of this lemma. The first is a combinatorial version of a probabilistic argument in the proof of [50, Thm 1.1]. We include it here since our terminology is different from theirs; similar arguments appear in [51].

First proof of Lemma 2.1. By computing $\#\{(\boldsymbol{x}, a) \in V \times M : \boldsymbol{x}a = 0\}$ in two ways, we obtain $\sum_{a \in M} |\mathrm{Ker}(a)| = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V} |\mathrm{c}_M(\boldsymbol{x})|$. As $\boldsymbol{x}M \approx_R M/\,\mathrm{c}_M(\boldsymbol{x})$, we have $|\mathrm{c}_M(\boldsymbol{x})| = |M|/|\boldsymbol{x}M|$ and thus $\mathrm{ask}(M \mid V) = |M|^{-1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in M} |\mathrm{c}_M(\boldsymbol{x})| = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in M} |\boldsymbol{x}M|^{-1}$. ⧫

Our second proof of Lemma 2.1 already hints at the connection between average sizes of kernels and orbits of linear groups, a subject further explored in §7. Recall that for a finite group G acting on a finite set X, the orbit-counting lemma asserts that $|X/G| = |G|^{-1} \sum_{g \in G} |\mathrm{Fix}(g)|$, where $\mathrm{Fix}(g) = \{x \in X : xg = x\}$.

Second proof of Lemma 2.1. The rule $a \mapsto a^* := \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & a \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ yields an isomorphism of $(M, +)$ onto a subgroup M^* of $\mathrm{GL}(V \oplus W)$. We claim that the natural bijection $V \oplus W \to \coprod_V W$ induces a bijection $(V \oplus W)/M^* \to \coprod_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V} W/xM$. Indeed, $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})a^* = (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{x}a)$ for $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in V \oplus W$. As $\mathrm{Fix}(a^*) = \mathrm{Ker}(a) \oplus W$, the orbit-counting lemma yields

$$|W| \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V} |\boldsymbol{x}M|^{-1} = |(V \oplus W)/M^*| = |M^*|^{-1} \sum_{a \in M} |\mathrm{Fix}(a^*)| = |W| \cdot \mathrm{ask}(M \mid V). \qquad ⧫$$

In order to deduce Proposition 1.1 from Lemma 2.1, note that $\boldsymbol{x}\,\mathrm{M}_{d \times e}(\mathbf{F}_q) = \mathbf{F}_q^e$ for each non-zero $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbf{F}_q^d$ whence $\mathrm{ask}(\mathrm{M}_{d \times e}(\mathbf{F}_q)) = 1 + (q^d - 1)q^{-e}$.

2.3 Direct sums

Lemma 2.2. *Let V' and W' be R-modules with $|V'|, |W'| < \infty$. Let $M' \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V', W')$ be a submodule. We regard $M \oplus M'$ as a submodule of $\mathrm{Hom}(V \oplus V', W \oplus W')$ in the natural way. Then $\mathrm{ask}(M \oplus M' \mid V \oplus V') = \mathrm{ask}(M \mid V) \cdot \mathrm{ask}(M' \mid V')$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ask}(M \oplus M' \mid V \oplus V') &= |M \oplus M'|^{-1} \cdot \sum_{(a,a') \in M \oplus M'} |\mathrm{Ker}(a \oplus a')| \\ &= |M|^{-1}|M'|^{-1} \cdot \sum_{(a,a') \in M \oplus M'} |\mathrm{Ker}(a)| \cdot |\mathrm{Ker}(a')| \\ &= \mathrm{ask}(M \mid V) \cdot \mathrm{ask}(M' \mid V'). \end{aligned}$$ ⧫

Corollary 2.3. *Let R be finite, $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(R)$ be a submodule, and $\tilde{M} \subset \mathrm{M}_{(d+1)\times e}(R)$ be obtained from M by adding a zero row to the elements of M in some fixed position. Then* $\mathrm{ask}(\tilde{M}) = \mathrm{ask}(M) \cdot |R|$. ♦

2.4 Matrix transposes

Following Kaplansky [43], we call R an **elementary divisor ring** if for each $a \in \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(R)$ (and all $d, e \geqslant 1$), there exist $u \in \mathrm{GL}_d(R)$ and $v \in \mathrm{GL}_e(R)$ such that uav is a diagonal matrix (padded with zeros according to the shape of a). For example, any quotient of a principal ideal domain is an elementary divisor ring (regardless of whether the quotient is an integral domain or not). Write $a^\top$ for the transpose of a.

Lemma 2.4. *Let R be a finite elementary divisor ring and let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(R)$ be a submodule. Then* $\mathrm{ask}(M^\top \mid V) = \mathrm{ask}(M \mid V) \cdot |R|^{e-d}$.

Proof. Let $a = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \mathrm{diag}(a_1,\ldots,a_r) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right] \in \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(R)$. Then $\mathrm{Ker}(a)$ consists of those $\boldsymbol{x} \in R^d$ with $a_i x_i = 0$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$ and $\mathrm{Ker}(a^\top)$ consists of those $\boldsymbol{y} \in R^e$ with $a_i y_i = 0$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. ♦

2.5 Reduction modulo $\mathfrak{a}$ and base change $R \to R/\mathfrak{a}$

Let V and W be finitely generated R-modules, the underlying sets of which need not be finite. As before, let $M \subset \mathrm{Hom}(V, W)$ be a submodule. Let $\mathfrak{a} \lhd R$ with $|R/\mathfrak{a}| < \infty$. Define $V_\mathfrak{a} := V \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{a}$, $W_\mathfrak{a} := W \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{a}$, and let $M_\mathfrak{a}$ be the image of the natural map $M \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(V, W) \to \mathrm{Hom}(V_\mathfrak{a}, W_\mathfrak{a})$. In general, the natural surjection $M \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{a} \twoheadrightarrow M_\mathfrak{a}$ need not be injective. However, if M is finitely generated, then $M \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{a}$ is finite and we obtain the following expression for $\mathrm{ask}(M_\mathfrak{a} \mid V_\mathfrak{a})$.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that M is finitely generated. Then*

$$\mathrm{ask}(M_\mathfrak{a} \mid V_\mathfrak{a}) = |M \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{a}|^{-1} \sum_{\bar{a} \in M \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{a}} |\mathrm{Ker}(\bar{a} \mid V_\mathfrak{a})|. \qquad ♦$$

3 Basic algebraic and analytic properties of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and $\zeta_M(s)$

3.1 Average sizes of kernels and Dirichlet series: $\zeta_M(s)$

While our main focus is on the generating functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ from the introduction, it is natural to also consider a global analogue. First suppose that R is a ring which contains only finitely many ideals $\mathfrak{a}$ of a given finite norm $|R/\mathfrak{a}|$. Given a submodule $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(R)$ acting on $V = R^d$ and an ideal $\mathfrak{a} \lhd R$, let $V_\mathfrak{a} = (R/\mathfrak{a})^d$, $W_\mathfrak{a} = (R/\mathfrak{a})^e$, and let $M_\mathfrak{a}$ denote the image of the natural map $M \hookrightarrow \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(R) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(R/\mathfrak{a})$ (cf. §2.5).

Definition 3.1.

(i) Define a formal Dirichlet series

$$\zeta_M(s) = \sum_{\mathfrak{a}} \mathrm{ask}(M_{\mathfrak{a}} \mid V_{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot |R/\mathfrak{a}|^{-s},$$

where the sum extends over the ideals of finite norm of R.

(ii) Let $\alpha_M \in [-\infty, \infty]$ denote the abscissa of convergence of $\zeta_M(s)$.

3.2 Abscissae of convergence: local case

Let K be a local field of arbitrary characteristic with valuation ring $\mathfrak{O}$ and residue field size q. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule acting on $V = \mathfrak{O}^d$. Then $\zeta_M(s) = \mathsf{Z}_M(q^{-s})$. Moreover, if $\mathfrak{O}$ has characteristic zero, then Theorem 1.4 (proved in §4.3.3) implies that α_M is precisely the largest real pole of (the meromorphic continuation of) $\zeta_M(s)$.

Recall that, unless otherwise indicated, tensors products are taken over $\mathfrak{O}$.

Definition 3.2. The **generic orbit rank** of M is $\mathrm{gor}(M) := \max_{\boldsymbol{x}\in V} \dim_K(\boldsymbol{x}M \otimes K)$.

Our choice of terminology will be justified by Proposition 4.12.

Proposition 3.3. $\max(d - \mathrm{gor}(M), 0) \leqslant \alpha_M \leqslant d$.

Proof. The upper bound follows since $\mathrm{ask}(M_n \mid V_n) \leqslant |V_n| = q^{nd}$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^{n(d-s)}$ converges for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > d$. Similarly, the lower bound follows from Lemma 2.1 and $\mathrm{ask}(M_n \mid V_n) \geqslant \max(|V_n|/q^{n\,\mathrm{gor}(M)}, 1)$. ♦

Let $0 \leqslant r \leqslant e$. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be obtained from $\mathrm{M}_{d\times r}(\mathfrak{O})$ by inserting $e - r$ zero columns in some fixed positions. Then $\mathrm{gor}(M) = r$, $\zeta_M(s) = \zeta_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times r}(\mathfrak{O})}(s)$, and it will follow from Proposition 1.5 that $\alpha_M = \max(d - r, 0)$. In particular, the bounds in Proposition 3.3 are optimal. We note that Example 8.1 below illustrates that the meromorphic continuation of $\zeta_M(s)$ (cf. Theorem 1.4) may have real poles less than $d - e$.

3.3 Abscissae of convergence in the global case and Euler products

Let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$. Let $\mathcal{V}_k$ denote the set of non-Archimedean places of k. For $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$, let k_v be the v-adic completion of k and let $\mathfrak{o}_v$ be its valuation ring. We let q_v denote the size of the residue field $\mathfrak{K}_v$ of k_v. For an $\mathfrak{o}$-module U and $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$, we write $U_v := U \otimes_{\mathfrak{o}} \mathfrak{o}_v$ (regarded as an $\mathfrak{o}_v$-module).

Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{o})$ be a submodule. For $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$, we may identify M_v with the $\mathfrak{o}_v$-submodule of $\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{o}_v)$ generated by M.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{o})$ be a submodule. Then:*

(i) $\alpha_M \leqslant d + 1$.

(ii) $\zeta_M(s) = \prod_{v\in\mathcal{V}_k} \zeta_{M_v}(s)$.

Proof. Let $V = \mathfrak{o}^d$. The proof of (i) is similar to that of Proposition 3.3. Namely, for each $\mathfrak{a} \lhd \mathfrak{o}$, $\mathrm{ask}(M_\mathfrak{a} \mid V_\mathfrak{a}) \leqslant |\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a}|^d$ and $\sum_\mathfrak{a} |\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a}|^{d-s} = \zeta_k(s-d)$ converges for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > d+1$, where $\zeta_k(s)$ is the Dedekind zeta function of k. For (ii), it suffices to show that for non-zero coprime ideals $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b} \lhd \mathfrak{o}$, $\mathrm{ask}(M_{\mathfrak{ab}} \mid V_{\mathfrak{ab}}) = \mathrm{ask}(M_\mathfrak{a} \mid V_\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathrm{ask}(M_\mathfrak{b} \mid V_\mathfrak{b})$.

To that end, the natural isomorphism $\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{ab} \to \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{b}$ yields an ($\mathfrak{o}$-module) isomorphism $M \otimes_\mathfrak{o} \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{ab} \to (M \otimes_\mathfrak{o} \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a}) \times (M \otimes_\mathfrak{o} \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{b})$ which is compatible with the corresponding isomorphism $V_{\mathfrak{ab}} \to V_\mathfrak{a} \times V_\mathfrak{b}$ in the evident way. Hence, for $\bar{a} \in M \otimes_\mathfrak{o} \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{ab}$ corresponding to $(\bar{a}_\mathfrak{a}, \bar{a}_\mathfrak{b}) \in (M \otimes_\mathfrak{o} \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a}) \times (M \otimes_\mathfrak{o} \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{b})$, we obtain an isomorphism $\mathrm{Ker}(\bar{a} \mid V_{\mathfrak{ab}}) \to \mathrm{Ker}(\bar{a}_\mathfrak{a} \mid V_\mathfrak{a}) \times \mathrm{Ker}(\bar{a}_\mathfrak{b} \mid V_\mathfrak{b})$. Part (ii) thus follows from Lemma 2.5. ⧫

Example 3.5. Let $\zeta_k(s)$ denote the Dedekind zeta function of k. Then Proposition 1.5 and Proposition 3.4(ii) imply that $\zeta_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{o})}(s) = \zeta_k(s)\zeta_k(s-d+e)/\zeta_k(s+e)$.

Further analytic properties of $\zeta_M(s)$ in a global setting will be derived in §4.4.

3.4 Hadamard products

Recall that the **Hadamard product** $F(T) \star G(T)$ of formal power series $F(T) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n T^n$ and $G(T) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty b_n T^n$ with coefficients in some common ring is

$$F(T) \star G(T) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n b_n T^n.$$

The following is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.2.

Corollary 3.6. *Let K be a local field of arbitrary characteristic with valuation ring $\mathfrak{O}$. Let $M = A \oplus B \subset \mathrm{M}_{d+e}(\mathfrak{O})$ for submodules $A \subset \mathrm{M}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ and $B \subset \mathrm{M}_e(\mathfrak{O})$. Then $\mathsf{Z}_M(T) = \mathsf{Z}_A(T) \star \mathsf{Z}_B(T)$.* ⧫

We note that Hadamard products of rational generating functions are well-known to be rational (see [60, Prop. 4.2.5]).

Corollary 3.7. *Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule. Define $f = \max(d, e)$. Let $\tilde{M} \subset \mathrm{M}_f(\mathfrak{O})$ be obtained from M by adding $f-d$ zero rows and $f-e$ zero columns to the elements of M in some fixed positions. Then $\mathsf{Z}_{\tilde{M}}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_M(q^{f-d}T)$.* ⧫

Thus, various questions on the series $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ are reduced to the case of square matrices.

3.5 Rescaling

Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field K of arbitrary characteristic. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule, $V = \mathfrak{O}^d$, and $W = \mathfrak{O}^e$.

Definition 3.8. For $m \geqslant 0$, let $\mathsf{Z}_M^m(T) := \sum_{n=m}^\infty \mathrm{ask}(M_n \mid V_n) \cdot T^{n-m} \in \mathbf{Q}[\![T]\!]$.

Note that $\mathsf{Z}_M(T) = \mathsf{Z}_M^0(T)$. For an $\mathfrak{O}$-module U, let $U^m = \mathfrak{P}^m U$ and write U_n^m for the common value of $(U^m)_n$ and $(U_n)^m$. Clearly, if $n \leqslant m$, then $\mathrm{ask}(M_n^m \mid V_n) = \mathrm{ask}(\{0\} \mid V_n) = |V_n| = q^{nd}$.

Proposition 3.9. $\mathsf{Z}^m_{M^m}(T) = q^{dm} \cdot \mathsf{Z}_M(T)$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $\mathrm{ask}(M^m_n \mid V_n) = q^{dm} \cdot \mathrm{ask}(M_{n-m} \mid V_{n-m})$ for $n \geqslant m$. Choose $\pi \in \mathfrak{P} \setminus \mathfrak{P}^2$. Observe that multiplication by π^m induces an $\mathfrak{O}$-module isomorphism $M_{n-m} \to M^m_n$ and a monomorphism $V_{n-m} \to V_n$ with image V^m_n. For $a \in M$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ker}(\pi^m a \mid V_n) &= \{\boldsymbol{x} \in V_n : \boldsymbol{x}(\pi^m a) \equiv 0 \pmod{W^n}\} \\ &= \{\boldsymbol{x} \in V_n : \boldsymbol{x}a \equiv 0 \pmod{W^{n-m}}\} \\ &= \{\boldsymbol{x} \in V_n : \boldsymbol{x} + V^{n-m} \in \mathrm{Ker}(a \mid V_{n-m})\}\end{aligned}$$

has size $|\mathrm{Ker}(a \mid V_{n-m})| \cdot q^{dm}$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ask}(M^m_n \mid V_n) &= |M^m_n|^{-1} \sum_{a \in M^m_n} |\mathrm{Ker}(a \mid V_n)| \\ &= |M_{n-m}|^{-1} \sum_{a \in M_{n-m}} |\mathrm{Ker}(a \mid V_{n-m})| \cdot q^{dm} \\ &= q^{dm} \cdot \mathrm{ask}(M_{n-m} \mid V_{n-m}).\end{aligned}$$

♦

4 Rationality of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and p-adic integration

Unless otherwise stated, in this section, K is a non-Archimedean local field of arbitrary characteristic with valuation ring $\mathfrak{O}$. Given a submodule $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$, we use the original definition of $\mathrm{ask}(M \mid V)$ as well as the alternative formula in Lemma 2.1 to derive two types of expressions for $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ in terms of p-adic integrals.

In §4.1, we describe a general setting for rewriting certain generating functions as integrals. By specialising to the case at hand, in §4.2, we obtain two expressions for $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ (Theorem 4.5) in terms of functions K_M and O_M that we introduce. In §4.3, we derive explicit formulae (in terms of the absolute value of K and polynomials over $\mathfrak{O}$) for these functions. These formulae serve two purposes. First, using established rationality results from p-adic integration, they allow us to deduce Theorem 1.4. Secondly, these formulae, in particular the one based on O_M (and hence on Lemma 2.1), lie at the heart of explicit formulae such as Proposition 1.5 in §5.

4.1 Generating functions and p-adic integrals

Let Z be a free $\mathfrak{O}$-module of finite rank d and let $U \subset Z$ be a submodule. By the elementary divisor theorem, there exists a unique sequence $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)$ with $0 \leqslant \lambda_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \lambda_d \leqslant \infty$ such that $Z/U \approx \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathfrak{O}_{\lambda_i}$ as $\mathfrak{O}$-modules; recall that $\mathfrak{O}_\infty = \mathfrak{O}$. We call $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)$ the **submodule type** of U within Z. Recall that the **isolator** $\mathrm{iso}_Z(U)$ of U in Z is the preimage of the torsion submodule of Z/U under the natural map $Z \twoheadrightarrow Z/U$—equivalently, $\mathrm{iso}_Z(U)$ is the smallest direct summand of Z which contains U. If U is isolated in Z (i.e. $U = \mathrm{iso}_Z(U)$), then we may naturally identify $U \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$ with the image U_n of $U \hookrightarrow Z \twoheadrightarrow Z_n := Z \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$. In that case, if U has rank ℓ, say, then $|U_n| = q^{\ell n}$. The general case is only slightly more complicated.

We let ν denote the valuation on K with value group $\mathbf{Z}$. Let $|\cdot|$ be the absolute value on K with $|\pi| = q^{-1}$ for $\pi \in \mathfrak{P} \setminus \mathfrak{P}^2$; we write $\|A\| = \sup(|a| : a \in A)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $U \subset Z$ be a submodule. Suppose that U has submodule type $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ within $\mathrm{iso}_Z(U)$. Let U_n denote the image of the natural map $U \hookrightarrow Z \twoheadrightarrow Z_n := Z \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$. Then $|U_n| = q^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}(n-\min(\lambda_i,n))}$. In particular, for $y \in \mathfrak{O}$ with $\nu(y) = n$, $|U_n| = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{\|\pi^{\lambda_i}, y\|}{|y|}$.*

Proof. Clearly, $|U_n| = q^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \min(n-\lambda_i,0)}$ and the first identity follows from $\min(0, n-a) = n - \min(n, a)$; the second claim then follows immediately. ♦

The following result is concerned with generating functions associated with a given family of "weight functions" $f_n \colon U_n \to \mathbf{R}_{\geqslant 0}$. Given a free $\mathfrak{O}$-module W of finite rank, let μ_W denote the Haar measure on W with $\mu_W(W) = 1$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $U \subset Z$ be a submodule. Suppose that U has submodule type $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ within $\mathrm{iso}_Z(U)$. Let U_n denote the image of $U \hookrightarrow Z \twoheadrightarrow Z_n := Z \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$ and let $\pi_n \colon U \to U_n$ denote the natural map. Let $N \geqslant 0$ and, for $n \geqslant N$, let $f_n \colon U_n \to \mathbf{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ be given. Define*

$$F \colon U \times \mathfrak{P}^N \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbf{R}_{\geqslant 0}, \quad (\boldsymbol{x}, y) \mapsto f_{\nu(y)}(\pi_{\nu(y)}(\boldsymbol{x}))$$

and extend F to a map $U \times \mathfrak{P}^N \to \mathbf{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ via $F(\boldsymbol{x}, 0) \equiv 0$. Let

$$g \colon \mathfrak{P}^N \times \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{R}_{\geqslant 0}, \quad (y, s) \mapsto |y|^{s-\ell-1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \|\pi^{\lambda_i}, y\|,$$

where we set $g(0, s) \equiv 0$. (Note that $g(y, s) = |y|^{s-1} \cdot |U_{\nu(y)}|$ for $y \neq 0$ by Lemma 4.1.)

Suppose that $\delta \geqslant 0$ satisfies $\sum_{\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in U_n} f_n(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}) = \mathcal{O}(q^{\delta n})$. Then, writing $t = q^{-s}$, for all $s \in \mathbf{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(s) > \delta$,

$$\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \sum_{\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in U_n} f_n(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}) t^n = (1 - q^{-1})^{-1} \int_{U \times \mathfrak{P}^N} F(\boldsymbol{x}, y) \cdot g(y, s) \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{U \times \mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x}, y). \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. First note that the left-hand side of (4.1) converges for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > \delta$. Further note that we may ignore the case $y = 0$ on the right-hand side as it occurs on a set of measure zero.

Let $U^n = \mathrm{Ker}(\pi_n \colon U \twoheadrightarrow U_n)$. Given $(\boldsymbol{x}, y) \in U \times \mathfrak{P}^N \setminus \{0\}$ with $n := \nu(y)$, the map F is constant on the open set $(\boldsymbol{x} + U^n) \times (y + \mathfrak{P}^{n+1})$; in particular, F is measurable.

Let $\mathcal{R}_n \subset U$ be a complete and irredundant set of representatives for the cosets of U^n and let $\mathcal{W}_n = \mathfrak{P}^n \cdot \mathfrak{O}^\times = \mathfrak{P}^n \setminus \mathfrak{P}^{n+1}$. By Lemma 4.1, $\mu_U(U^n) = |U_n|^{-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{|y|}{\|\pi^{\lambda_i}, y\|}$ for

any $y \in \mathcal{W}_n$; moreover, $\mu_{\mathfrak{O}}(\mathcal{W}_n) = (1-q^{-1})q^{-n}$. The claim now follows via

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{U\times\mathfrak{P}^N} F(\boldsymbol{x},y)\cdot g(y,s)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_{U\times\mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x},y) &= \sum_{n=N}^{\infty}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{R}_n}\int_{(\boldsymbol{x}+U^n)\times\mathcal{W}_n} f_n(\pi_n(\boldsymbol{x}))\cdot \underbrace{g(y,s)}_{=|U_n|\cdot(qt)^n}\,\mathrm{d}\mu_{U\times\mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x},y)\\ &= (1-q^{-1})\sum_{n=N}^{\infty}\sum_{\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}\in U_n} f_n(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}})\cdot\mu(U^n\times\mathcal{W}_n)\cdot|U_n|\cdot(qt)^n.\\ &= (1-q^{-1})\sum_{n=N}^{\infty}\sum_{\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}\in U_n} f_n(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}})t^n. \qquad \blacklozenge\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.3. The introduction of the additional variable y to express a generating function as an integral in Lemma 4.2 mimics similar formulae of Jaikin-Zapirain [42, §4] and Voll [67, §2.2].

4.2 $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and the functions K_M and O_M

Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule, $V = \mathfrak{O}^d$, and $W = \mathfrak{O}^e$.

Definition 4.4. Define

$$\mathrm{K}_M\colon M\times\mathfrak{O}\to\mathbf{N}_0\cup\{\infty\},\quad (a,y)\mapsto \#\mathrm{Ker}\Big(V\otimes\mathfrak{O}/(y)\xrightarrow{a\otimes\mathfrak{O}/(y)} W\otimes\mathfrak{O}/(y)\Big) \text{ and}$$

$$\mathrm{O}_M\colon V\times\mathfrak{O}\to\mathbf{N}_0\cup\{\infty\},\quad (\boldsymbol{x},y)\mapsto \#\,\mathrm{Im}\Big(\boldsymbol{x}M\hookrightarrow W\twoheadrightarrow W\otimes\mathfrak{O}/(y)\Big).$$

Note that for $y\neq 0$, $1\leqslant \mathrm{K}_M(a,y)\leqslant |y|^{-d}$ and $1\leqslant \mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x},y)\leqslant |y|^{-\operatorname{gor}(M)}$ (see Definition 3.2); these are the same estimates as in Proposition 3.3.

Using Lemmas 2.1 and 4.2, we obtain the following formulae for $\mathsf{Z}_M(t)$ (where $t=q^{-s}$).

Theorem 4.5. *For $s\in\mathbf{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(s)>d$,*

$$(1-q^{-1})\cdot\mathsf{Z}_M(q^{-s}) = \int_{M\times\mathfrak{O}}|y|^{s-1}\cdot\mathrm{K}_M(a,y)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_{M\times\mathfrak{O}}(a,y) = \int_{V\times\mathfrak{O}}\frac{|y|^{s-d-1}}{\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x},y)}\,\mathrm{d}\mu_{V\times\mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x},y).$$

Proof. The given formulae for $(1-q^{-1})\cdot\mathsf{Z}_M(q^{-s})$ are based on $\mathrm{ask}(M_n\mid V_n) = |M_n|^{-1}\cdot\sum_{a\in M_n}|\mathrm{Ker}(a)|$ and $\mathrm{ask}(M_n\mid V_n)=\sum_{\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}\in V_n}|\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}M_n|^{-1}$ (Lemma 2.1), respectively. In detail, the first equality follows from Lemma 4.2 with $U=M$, $Z=\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$, $F(a,y)=|M_{\nu(y)}|^{-1}\,\mathrm{K}_M(a,y)$ and $g(y,s)=|y|^{s-1}\cdot|M_{\nu(y)}|$ (for $y\neq 0$). For the second equality, use Lemma 4.2 with $U=Z=V$, $F(\boldsymbol{x},y)=|(\boldsymbol{x}+y\mathfrak{O}^d)M_{\nu(y)}|^{-1}=\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x},y)^{-1}$ and $g(y,s)=|y|^{s-d-1}$ (for $y\neq 0$). $\blacklozenge$

4.3 Explicit formulae for K_M and O_M

As before, let $M\subset\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule. In order to use Theorem 4.5 for theoretical investigations or explicit computations of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$, we need to produce sufficiently explicit formulae for $\mathrm{K}_M(a,y)$ or $\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x},y)$.

4.3.1 The sizes of kernels and images

Let $a \in \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ have rank r over K. Fix $\pi \in \mathfrak{P} \setminus \mathfrak{P}^2$. By the elementary divisor theorem, there are $0 \leqslant \lambda_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \lambda_r$, $u \in \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$, and $v \in \mathrm{GL}_e(\mathfrak{O})$ such that

$$uav = \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{diag}(\pi^{\lambda_1}, \ldots, \pi^{\lambda_r}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.2}$$

We call $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ the **equivalence type** of a.

For a set of polynomials $\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{Y})$, we write $\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{y}) = \{f(\boldsymbol{y}) : f \in \boldsymbol{f}\}$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $a \in \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ have rank r over K and equivalence type $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$. Let $\boldsymbol{f}_i(\boldsymbol{Y}) \subset \mathbf{Z}[\boldsymbol{Y}] := \mathbf{Z}[Y_{ij} : 1 \leqslant i \leqslant d, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant e]$ be the set of non-zero $i \times i$ minors of the generic $d \times e$ matrix $[Y_{ij}] \in \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathbf{Z}[\boldsymbol{Y}])$. (Hence, $\boldsymbol{f}_0(\boldsymbol{Y}) = \{1\}$.) Let $a_n \in \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O}_n)$ be the image of the matrix a under the natural map $\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O}_n)$. Then:*

(i) $\|\boldsymbol{f}_i(a)\| = q^{-\lambda_1-\cdots-\lambda_i}$ *for* $0 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.

(ii) (Cf. [67, §2.2]) $\frac{\|\boldsymbol{f}_{i-1}(a)\|}{\|\boldsymbol{f}_i(a) \cup \pi^n \boldsymbol{f}_{i-1}(a)\|} = q^{\min(\lambda_i, n)}$ *for* $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.

(iii) $|\mathrm{Ker}(a_n)| = q^{\min(\lambda_1,n)+\cdots+\min(\lambda_r,n)+(d-r)n}$.

(iv) $|\mathrm{Im}(a_n)| = q^{rn-(\min(\lambda_1,n)+\cdots+\min(\lambda_r,n))}$.

Proof. The first part is elementary linear algebra. Part (ii) then follows from

$$q^{-\lambda_1-\cdots-\lambda_{i-1}+\min(\lambda_1+\cdots+\lambda_i, \lambda_1+\cdots+\lambda_{i-1}+n)} = q^{\min(\lambda_i,n)}.$$

For $0 \leqslant i \leqslant n$, the map $\mathfrak{O}_n \to \mathfrak{O}_n$ given by multiplication by π^i has kernel and image size q^i and q^{n-i}, respectively. Parts (iii)–(iv) thus follow from equation (4.2). ♦

4.3.2 A formula for K_M

We use Lemma 4.6 in order to derive a formula for $\mathrm{K}_M(a, y)$.

Definition 4.7. The **generic element rank** of M is $\mathrm{grk}(M) := \max_{a\in M} \mathrm{rk}_K(a)$.

By the following, $\mathrm{grk}(M)$ is the rank of a "generic" matrix in M in any meaningful sense.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $(a_1, \ldots, a_\ell)$ be an $\mathfrak{O}$-basis of M and let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_\ell$ be algebraically independent over K. Then:*

(i) $\mathrm{grk}(M) = \mathrm{rk}_{K(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_\ell)}(\lambda_1 a_1 + \cdots + \lambda_\ell a_\ell)$.

(ii) $\mu_M(\{a \in M : \mathrm{rk}_K(a) < \mathrm{grk}(M)\}) = 0$.

Proof. Let r denote the right-hand side in (i). Then r is the largest number such that some $r \times r$ minor, $m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ say, of $\lambda_1 a_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell a_\ell$ is non-zero. In particular, $\mathrm{grk}(M) \leqslant r$. Conversely, since $m(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \neq 0$, we find $c_1, \dots, c_\ell \in \mathfrak{O}$ with $m(c_1, \dots, c_\ell) \neq 0$ whence $\mathrm{grk}(M) \geqslant r$. Finally, the well-known fact (provable using induction and Fubini's theorem) that the zero locus of a non-zero polynomial over K has measure zero implies (ii). ⧫

Excluding a set of measure zero, we thus obtain the following formula for $\mathrm{K}_M(a, y)$.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $N = \{a \in M : \mathrm{rk}_K(a) < \mathrm{grk}(M)\}$ and let $\boldsymbol{f}_i(\boldsymbol{Y})$ be the set of non-zero $i \times i$ minors of the generic $d \times e$ matrix. Then for all $a \in M \setminus N$ and $y \in \mathfrak{O} \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$\mathrm{K}_M(a, y) = |y|^{\mathrm{grk}(M)-d} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\mathrm{grk}(M)} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{f}_{i-1}(a)\|}{\|\boldsymbol{f}_i(a) \cup y\boldsymbol{f}_{i-1}(a)\|}.$$

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 4.6(ii)–(iii). ⧫

Hence, using Theorem 4.5, we conclude that

$$\mathsf{Z}_M(q^{-s}) = (1 - q^{-1})^{-1} \int_{M \times \mathfrak{O}} |y|^{s+\mathrm{grk}(M)-d-1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\mathrm{grk}(M)} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{f}_{i-1}(a)\|}{\|\boldsymbol{f}_i(a) \cup y\boldsymbol{f}_{i-1}(a)\|} \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{M \times \mathfrak{O}}(a, y). \quad (4.3)$$

4.3.3 Rationality and variation of the place

As in the proof of Proposition 4.8, we may replace the $\boldsymbol{f}_i(\boldsymbol{Y})$ in (4.3) by polynomials in a chosen system of coordinates of M. We may thus interpret the integral in (4.3) as being defined in terms of valuations of polynomial expressions in $\dim_K(M \otimes K) + 1$ variables. Integrals of this form have been studied extensively. In particular, using well-known results going back to work of Igusa and Denef (see [17]), initially for a single polynomial and later extended to families of polynomials (see, in particular, work of du Sautoy and Grunewald [23], Veys and Zúñiga-Galindo [66], and Voll [67]), we obtain the following two results, the first of which implies and refines Theorem 1.4.

Corollary 4.10. *Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a local field of characteristic zero and let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d \times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule. Then $\mathsf{Z}_M(T) \in \mathbf{Q}(T)$. More precisely, there exist $f(T) \in \mathbf{Z}[T]$, non-zero $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_r, b_r)$ with $(a_i, b_i) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \mathbf{N}_0$, and $m \in \mathbf{N}_0$ such that*

$$\mathsf{Z}_M(T) = \frac{f(T)}{q^m(1 - q^{a_1}T^{b_1}) \cdots (1 - q^{a_r}T^{b_r})}.$$ ⧫

Moreover, in a global setting, the dependence of Euler factors on the place is as follows.

Corollary 4.11. *Let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$. Recall the notation from §3.3. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d \times e}(\mathfrak{o})$ be a submodule. There are separated $\mathfrak{o}$-schemes $V_1, \dots, V_r$ of finite type and rational functions $W_1(X, T), \dots, W_r(X, T) \in \mathbf{Q}(X, T)$ (which can be written over denominators of the same shape as those in Corollary 4.10) such that the following holds: for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$,*

$$\mathsf{Z}_{M_v}(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \#V_i(\mathfrak{K}_v) \cdot W_i(q_v, T). \quad (4.4)$$ ⧫

4.3.4 A formula for O_M

As in the case of K_M, we can produce a formula for O_M.

Let $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ be algebraically independent over K. Let $C(\boldsymbol{X}) \in \mathrm{M}_{\ell \times e}(\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}])$ with $\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}]^d \cdot C(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{X} \cdot (M \otimes \mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}])$. For example, we may choose generators $a_1, \ldots, a_\ell$ of M as an $\mathfrak{O}$-module and take

$$C(\boldsymbol{X}) = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{X}a_1 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{X}a_\ell \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{M}_{\ell \times e}(\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}]).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{g}_i(\boldsymbol{X})$ be the set of non-zero $i \times i$ minors of $C(\boldsymbol{X})$. Note that if $\boldsymbol{x} \in V$, then $\boldsymbol{x}M$ is the row span of $C(\boldsymbol{x})$ over $\mathfrak{O}$ so that, in particular, $\dim_K(\boldsymbol{x}M \otimes K) = \mathrm{rk}_K(C(\boldsymbol{x}))$.

Recall the definition of $\mathrm{gor}(M)$ in Definition 3.2. The following is proved in the same way as Proposition 4.8.

Proposition 4.12. *Let $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ be algebraically independent over K. Then:*

(i) $\mathrm{gor}(M) = \dim_{K(\boldsymbol{X})}(\boldsymbol{X} \cdot (M \otimes K(\boldsymbol{X}))) = \mathrm{rk}_{K(\boldsymbol{X})}(C(\boldsymbol{X}))$.

(ii) $\mu_V(\{\boldsymbol{x} \in V : \dim_K(\boldsymbol{x}M \otimes K) < \mathrm{gor}(M)\}) = 0$. ♦

The following analogue of Corollary 4.13 is obtained using Lemma 4.6(ii),(iv).

Corollary 4.13. *Let $Z = \{\boldsymbol{x} \in V : \dim_K(\boldsymbol{x}M \otimes K) < \mathrm{gor}(M)\}$. Then for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in V \setminus Z$ and $y \in \mathfrak{O} \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x}, y) = |y|^{-\mathrm{gor}(M)} \prod_{i=1}^{\mathrm{gor}(M)} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{g}_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \cup y\boldsymbol{g}_{i-1}(\boldsymbol{x})\|}{\|\boldsymbol{g}_{i-1}(\boldsymbol{x})\|}. \tag{4.5}$$

♦

Theorem 4.5 thus provides us with the following counterpart of (4.3):

$$\mathsf{Z}_M(q^{-s}) = (1 - q^{-1})^{-1} \int_{V \times \mathfrak{O}} |y|^{s + \mathrm{gor}(M) - d - 1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\mathrm{gor}(M)} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{g}_{i-1}(\boldsymbol{x})\|}{\|\boldsymbol{g}_i(\boldsymbol{x}) \cup y\boldsymbol{g}_{i-1}(\boldsymbol{x})\|} \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{V \times \mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x}, y). \tag{4.6}$$

Despite the essentially identical shapes of the integrals in (4.3) and (4.6), either type might be vastly more useful for explicit computations of specific examples. In particular, §5 is concerned with examples of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ that can be easily computed using (4.6) and §6 considers the analogous situations for (4.3). A very similar phenomenon was exploited by O'Brien and Voll [53, §5] in their enumeration of conjugacy classes of certain relatively free p-groups.

Remark 4.14. We note that the integrals in (4.3)–(4.6) are almost of the same shape as those in [1, Eqn (1.4)]. Moreover, our matrix $C(\boldsymbol{X})$ plays the same role as the commutator matrix $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{Y})$ in [1, §3.1] and [61, §2.2.2]. These similarities can be clarified further by rewriting our integrals slightly; see the proof of Theorem 4.15 below.

4.4 Local functional equations and global analytic properties

Functional equations under "inversion of the prime" are a common (but not universal) phenomenon in the theory of local zeta functions. Denef and Meuser [18] showed that for a homogeneous polynomial over a number field, almost all of its associated local Igusa zeta functions satisfy such a functional equation. Vastly generalising their result, Voll [67] established functional equations for numerous types of zeta functions arising in asymptotic algebra and expressible in terms of p-adic integrals. Using the formalism developed above, we may deduce the following; recall the notation from §3.3.

Theorem 4.15. *Let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{o})$ be a submodule. Recall that $\zeta_{M_v}(s) = \mathsf{Z}_{M_v}(q_v^{-s})$ for $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$. Then for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$,*

$$\zeta_{M_v}(s) \Big|_{q_v \to q_v^{-1}} = (-q^{d-s}) \cdot \zeta_{M_v}(s).$$

Remark 4.16. The operation "$q_v \to q_v^{-1}$" can be unambiguously defined in terms of an arbitrary formula of the form (4.4); see [18,67] and cf. [56, Cor. 5.3]. If $\mathsf{Z}_{M_v}(T) = W(q_v, T)$ for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$ and some $W(X,T) \in \mathbf{Q}(X,T)$, then Theorem 4.15 asserts that $W(X^{-1}, T^{-1}) = (-X^d T) \cdot W(X,T)$; see [56, §5].

Proof of Theorem 4.15. We rewrite the second integral in Theorem 4.5 in a form that allows us to invoke Voll's results from [67, §2.1]. Let $K = k_v$ for $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$ and let $\mathfrak{O}$, $|\cdot|$, etc. be as before. Fix $\pi \in \mathfrak{P} \setminus \mathfrak{P}^2$. Clearly, $\mathrm{O}_{M_v}(\pi \boldsymbol{x}, \pi y) = \mathrm{O}_{M_v}(\boldsymbol{x}, y)$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \in V := \mathfrak{O}^d$ and $y \in \mathfrak{O} \setminus \{0\}$. Writing $t = q_v^{-s}$, Theorem 4.5 and a change of variables thus show that $(1-q_v^{-1})^{-1} \cdot t\mathsf{Z}_{M_v}(t) = \int\limits_{\mathfrak{P}V \times \mathfrak{P}} \frac{|y|^{s-d-1}}{\mathrm{O}_{M_v}(\boldsymbol{x},y)} \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{V\times\mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x}, y)$. Let

$$H_v(s) := 1 + (1-q^{-1})^{-1} \int\limits_{(V\setminus\mathfrak{P}V)\times\mathfrak{P}} \frac{|y|^{s-d-1}}{\mathrm{O}_{M_v}(\boldsymbol{x}, y)} \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{V\times\mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x}, y). \tag{4.7}$$

As $\mathrm{O}_{M_v}(\boldsymbol{x}, y) = 1$ for all $x \in V$ and $y \in \mathfrak{O}^\times$, $\mathsf{Z}_{M_v}(t) = H_v(s)/(1-t)$. We may then use the surjection $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \to V \setminus \mathfrak{P}V$ which sends a matrix to its first row to rewrite (4.7) in terms of an integral over $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \times \mathfrak{P}$; cf. [1, §4]. In the setting of the explicit formula for $\mathrm{O}_{M_v}(\boldsymbol{x}, y)$ derived in §4.3.4, we may assume that $C(\boldsymbol{X})$ is a matrix of linear forms whence each $\boldsymbol{g}_i(\boldsymbol{X})$ consists of homogeneous polynomials of degree i. This allows us to use [67, Cor. 2.4] which shows that $H_v(s)\big|_{q_v \to q_v^{-1}} = q^d H_v(s)$ for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$. ♦

Based on work of du Sautoy and Grunewald [23], Duong and Voll [26] studied analytic properties of Euler products of functions of the same form as the $H_v(s)$ in (4.7). In particular, their findings allow us to deduce the following.

Theorem 4.17 (Cf. [26, Thm A])**.** *Let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{o})$ be a submodule and $V = \mathfrak{o}^d$.*

(i) The abscissa of convergence α_M of $\zeta_M(s)$ is a rational number.

(ii) There exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\zeta_M(s)$ admits meromorphic continuation to $\{s \in \mathbf{C} : \mathrm{Re}(s) > \alpha_M - \delta\}$. This continued function has a pole of order β_M, say, at $s = \alpha_M$ but no other poles on the line $\mathrm{Re}(s) = \alpha_M$.

(iii) α_M and β_M are (and δ can be chosen to be) invariant under base change of M from $\mathfrak{o}$ to the ring of integers of an arbitrary finite extension of k.

5 Full matrix algebras, classical Lie algebras, and relatives

In this section, let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field of arbitrary characteristic. Apart from proving Proposition 1.5, we compute examples of $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T)$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ ranges over various infinite families of matrix Lie algebras. At the heart of these computations lies the notion of "O-maximality" introduced in §5.1.

5.1 O-maximality

Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule and $V = \mathfrak{O}^d$. As we will now see, if $\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x}, y)$ is (generically) as large as possible, then $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ coincides with $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times \mathrm{gor}(M)}}(T)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in V \setminus \{0\}$ and $y \in \mathfrak{O} \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x}, y) \leqslant |y|^{-\mathrm{gor}(M)} \|\boldsymbol{x}, y\|^{\mathrm{gor}(M)}$.*

Proof. Let $C(\boldsymbol{X}) \in \mathrm{M}_{\ell\times e}(\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}])$ with $\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}]^d \cdot C(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{X} \cdot (M \otimes \mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}])$. As $0_{\mathfrak{O}^d} \cdot M = \{0_{\mathfrak{O}^e}\}$, the constant terms of all non-zero polynomials in $C(\boldsymbol{X})$ vanish whence $\|C(\boldsymbol{x})\| \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{x}\|$. Thus, if $C(\boldsymbol{x})$ has equivalence type $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$, then $|\pi^{\lambda_i}| \leqslant |\pi^{\lambda_1}| = \|C(\boldsymbol{x})\| \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{x}\|$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. Define m and n via $q^{-m} = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|$ and $n = \nu(y)$. Then, by Lemma 4.6(iv),

$$\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x}, y) = q^{rn - \sum_{i=1}^r \min(\lambda_i, n)} \leqslant q^{\mathrm{gor}(M)(n - \min(m,n))} = |y|^{-\mathrm{gor}(M)} \|\boldsymbol{x}, y\|^{\mathrm{gor}(M)}. \qquad \blacklozenge$$

The above inequality is sharp (cf. the comments after Proposition 3.3):

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in V \setminus \{0\}$ and $y \in \mathfrak{O} \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})}(\boldsymbol{x}, y) = |y|^{-e} \|\boldsymbol{x}, y\|^e$.*

Proof. Let $(\boldsymbol{e}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{e}_d) \subset \mathfrak{O}^d$ be the standard basis. As $\boldsymbol{x}\,\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ is generated by $\{\gcd(x_1, \dots, x_d)\boldsymbol{e}_i : i = 1, \dots, e\}$, the claim follows from Lemma 4.6(iv). $\blacklozenge$

Definition 5.3. We say that M is **O-maximal** if $\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x}, y) = |y|^{-\mathrm{gor}(M)} \|\boldsymbol{x}, y\|^{\mathrm{gor}(M)}$ for all $(\boldsymbol{x}, y) \in V \times \mathfrak{O}$ outside a set of measure zero.

Proposition 1.5 serves as a blueprint for $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ whenever M is O-maximal:

Corollary 5.4. *If M is O-maximal, then $\mathsf{Z}_M(T) = \mathsf{Z}_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times \mathrm{gor}(M)}(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$.*

Proof. Combine (4.6) and Lemma 5.2. $\blacklozenge$

We will repeatedly use the following lemma to prove O-maximality.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$. Let $C(\boldsymbol{X}) \in \mathrm{M}_{\ell\times e}(\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}])$ with $\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}]^d C(\boldsymbol{X}) = \boldsymbol{X} \cdot (M \otimes \mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}])$. Suppose that for $i = 1, \dots, \mathrm{gor}(M)$, the ideal of $\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}]$ generated by the $i \times i$ minors of $C(\boldsymbol{X})$ contains $X_1^i, \dots, X_d^i$. Then M is O-maximal.*

Proof. As in §4.3.4, let $\boldsymbol{g}_i(\boldsymbol{X})$ be the set of non-zero $i \times i$ minors of $C(\boldsymbol{X})$. Let $\boldsymbol{h}_i(\boldsymbol{X}) = \{\boldsymbol{X}^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbf{N}_0^d, \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_d = i\}$. Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^d$ with $x_1 \cdots x_d \neq 0$ and $y \in \mathfrak{O} \setminus \{0\}$. Since the constant term of each $f(X) \in \boldsymbol{g}_i(\boldsymbol{X})$ vanishes for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant \operatorname{gor}(M)$ (see the proof of Lemma 5.1), each monomial in $f(\boldsymbol{X})$ has total degree at least i whence $|f(\boldsymbol{x})| \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{h}_i(\boldsymbol{x})\|$ and therefore $\|\boldsymbol{g}_i(\boldsymbol{x})\| \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{h}_i(\boldsymbol{x})\| = \|x_1^i, \ldots, x_d^i\|$. By our assumption, $\|\boldsymbol{g}_i(\boldsymbol{x})\| \geqslant \|x_1^i, \ldots, x_d^i\| = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^i$; in particular, $\dim_K(\boldsymbol{x}M \otimes K) = \operatorname{gor}(M)$. Thus, by Corollary 4.13, M is O_M-maximal since

$$\mathrm{O}_M(\boldsymbol{x}, y) = |y|^{-\operatorname{gor}(M)} \prod_{i=1}^{\operatorname{gor}(M)} \frac{\max(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^i, |y| \cdot \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{i-1})}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{i-1}} = |y|^{-\operatorname{gor}(M)} \|\boldsymbol{x}, y\|^{\operatorname{gor}(M)}. \qquad \blacklozenge$$

For a geometric interpretation of Lemma 5.5 in a global setting, see Proposition 6.10.

5.2 Proof of Proposition 1.5

Our proof of Proposition 1.5 and other computations in §5.3 rely on the following.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $a_0, \ldots, a_r \in \mathbf{C}$ and write $\sigma_j = a_0 + \cdots + a_j$. Suppose that the integral*

$$F_r(a_0, \ldots, a_r) := \int_{\mathfrak{O}^r \times \mathfrak{O}} |y|^{a_0} \|x_1, y\|^{a_1} \cdots \|x_1, \ldots, x_r, y\|^{a_r} \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathfrak{O}^r \times \mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x}, y),$$

is absolutely convergent. Then

$$F_r(a_0, \ldots, a_r) = \frac{1 - q^{-1}}{1 - q^{-\sigma_r - r - 1}} \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \frac{1 - q^{-\sigma_j - j - 2}}{1 - q^{-\sigma_j - j - 1}}.$$

In particular, in the special case $a_1 = \cdots = a_{r-1} = 0$, we obtain

$$F_r(a_0, 0, \ldots, 0, a_r) = \frac{(1 - q^{-1})(1 - q^{-a_0 - r - 1})}{(1 - q^{-a_0 - a_r - r - 1})(1 - q^{-a_0 - 1})}.$$

Proof. Both claims follow by induction from the identities (a) $F_0(a_0) = \frac{1-q^{-1}}{1-q^{-1-a_0}}$ and (b) $F_r(a_0, \ldots, a_r) = F_{r-1}(a_0 + a_1 + 1, a_2, \ldots, a_r) \cdot \frac{1-q^{-a_0-2}}{1-q^{-a_0-1}}$ for $r \geqslant 1$. The formula for $F_0(a_0)$ in (a) is well-known and easily proved. By performing a change of variables according to whether $|x_1| \leqslant |y|$ or $|x_1| > |y|$, we find that $F_r(a_0, \ldots, a_r) = F_{r-1}(a_0 + a_1 + 1, a_2, \ldots, a_r) \cdot (1 + \int_{\mathfrak{P}} |y|^{a_0} \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathfrak{O}}(y))$ whence (b) follows readily. $\blacklozenge$

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Using (4.6) and Lemma 5.2, we obtain

$$\mathsf{Z}_{\mathrm{M}_{d \times e}(\mathfrak{O})}(q^{-s}) = (1 - q^{-1})^{-1} \int_{\mathfrak{O}^d \times \mathfrak{O}} |y|^{s+e-d-1} \|\boldsymbol{x}, y\|^{-e} \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\mathfrak{O}^d \times \mathfrak{O}}(\boldsymbol{x}, y). \tag{5.1}$$

whence the claim follows from Lemma 5.6. $\blacklozenge$

Remark 5.7.

(i) Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be any submodule. By combining Lemma 5.1 and (5.1), we thus obtain another interpretation of the lower bound in Proposition 3.3 in the form $\alpha_M \geqslant \alpha_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times \mathrm{gor}(\mathfrak{O})}(\mathfrak{O})} = \max(d - \mathrm{gor}(\mathfrak{O}), 0)$.

(ii) We note that (1.1) could also be derived in an elementary fashion (without using p-adic integration) using Lemma 2.1 and ad hoc computations with generating functions. Such an approach quickly becomes cumbersome for more complicated examples such as most of those in §8. The author is, moreover, unaware of elementary proofs of general results such as Theorems 1.4 and 4.15.

5.3 Classical Lie algebras and relatives

Reminder. Let R be a ring. Recall the definitions of the **special linear**, **orthogonal**, and **symplectic** Lie algebras

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{sl}_d(R) &= \{a \in \mathfrak{gl}_d(R) : \mathrm{trace}(a) = 0\},\\
\mathfrak{so}_d(R) &= \{a \in \mathfrak{gl}_d(R) : a + a^\top = 0\} \quad (\text{assuming } \mathrm{char}(R) \neq 2), \text{ and}\\
\mathfrak{sp}_{2d}(R) &= \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a^\top \end{bmatrix} : a, b, c \in \mathrm{M}_d(R), b = b^\top, c = c^\top \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

These are Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{gl}_d(R)$ and $\mathfrak{gl}_{2d}(R)$, respectively. Finally, we let $\mathfrak{tr}_d(R)$ and $\mathfrak{n}_d(R)$ denote the Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{gl}_d(R)$ consisting of upper triangular matrices and strictly upper triangular matrices, respectively.

We now determine $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T)$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is one of the Lie algebras from above. Of course, the case $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ is covered by Proposition 1.5. Next, clearly, $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{sl}_1(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = 1/(1-qT)$. The general case of $\mathfrak{sl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ offers nothing new.

Corollary 5.8. *Let $d > 1$. Then $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{sl}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{1-q^{-d}T}{(1-T)^2}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{sl}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \supset \boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^d \setminus \{0\}$. Let x_ℓ have minimal valuation among the entries of $\boldsymbol{x}$. Let $\boldsymbol{e}_j \in \mathfrak{O}^d$ be the jth unit vector. By our proof of Lemma 5.2, $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ is generated by $\{x_\ell \boldsymbol{e}_j : 1 \leqslant j \leqslant d\}$. Note that $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{sl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ is spanned by all $x_i \boldsymbol{e}_j$ and $x_i \boldsymbol{e}_i - x_j \boldsymbol{e}_j$ for $1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant d$ with $i \neq j$. It thus only remains to show that $x_\ell \boldsymbol{e}_\ell \in \boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{sl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$. Since $d > 1$, we may choose $j \neq \ell$. Since $|x_j| \leqslant |x_\ell|$, $x_\ell \boldsymbol{e}_\ell = (x_\ell \boldsymbol{e}_\ell - x_j \boldsymbol{e}_j) + \frac{x_j}{x_\ell} x_\ell \boldsymbol{e}_j \in \boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{sl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ whence the claim follows. ♦

Proposition 5.9. *Let $\mathrm{char}(K) \neq 2$. Then $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{so}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_{\mathrm{M}_{d\times(d-1)}(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{1-q^{1-d}T}{(1-T)(1-qT)}$.*

Remark 5.10.

(i) It is instructive to first determine $\mathrm{ask}(\mathfrak{so}_d(\mathbf{F}_q))$ for odd q. If F is any field with $\mathrm{char}(F) \neq 2$, then it is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{so}_d(F) = \boldsymbol{x}^\perp$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in F^d \setminus \{0\}$, where

the orthogonal complement is taken with respect to the standard inner product. In particular, if $\boldsymbol{x} \neq 0$, then $\dim_F(\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{so}_d(F)) = d-1$. Using Lemma 2.1, we conclude that $\operatorname{ask}(\mathfrak{so}_d(\mathbf{F}_q)) = 1 + \frac{q^d-1}{q^{d-1}} = 1 - q^{1-d} + q$ for odd q; this identity was first proved probabilistically by Fulman and Goldstein [28, Lem. 5.3]. We note that for $\operatorname{char}(K) \neq 2$ and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^d$, while we still have an inclusion $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \mathfrak{so}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \subset \boldsymbol{x}^\perp$, equality does not, in general, hold; indeed, $\boldsymbol{x}^\perp$ is always an isolated submodule of $\mathfrak{O}^d$.

(ii) While we assumed that $\operatorname{char}(K) \neq 2$ in Proposition 5.9, we do allow $\operatorname{char}(\mathfrak{O}/\mathfrak{P}) = 2$. Note, however, that in this case, $\mathfrak{so}_d(\mathfrak{O})_n (= \mathfrak{so}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n)$ is properly contained in the set of all skew-symmetric $d \times d$-matrices over $\mathfrak{O}_n$.

Proof of Proposition 5.9. Part (i) of the preceding remark implies that $\operatorname{gor}(\mathfrak{so}_d(\mathfrak{O})) = d-1$. Given elements $z_1, \ldots, z_\ell$ of some ring, we recursively define a matrix

$$m(z_1, \ldots, z_\ell) := \left[\begin{array}{c|ccc} -z_2 & z_1 & & \\ -z_3 & & z_1 & \\ \vdots & & & \ddots \\ -z_\ell & & & z_1 \\ \hline 0 & & & \\ \vdots & & m(z_2, \ldots, z_\ell) & \\ 0 & & & \end{array}\right].$$

By induction, we may assume that $\pm X_2^i, \ldots, \pm X_d^i$ are $i \times i$ minors of $m(X_2, \ldots, X_d)$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d-2$ so that $\pm X_1^j, \ldots, \pm X_d^j$ are $j \times j$ minors of $m(X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant d-1$. Let $e_{ij} \in \mathrm{M}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ be the elementary matrix with 1 in position (i,j) and zeros elsewhere. Then the $e_{ij} - e_{ji}$ for $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant d$ generate $\mathfrak{so}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ as an $\mathfrak{O}$-module whence the rows of $m(X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ span $\boldsymbol{X} \cdot \mathfrak{so}_d(\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}])$. Thus, $\mathfrak{so}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ is O-maximal by Lemma 5.5 and the claim follows from Corollary 5.4. ♦

For a ring R, let $\operatorname{Sym}_d(R) = \{a \in \mathrm{M}_d(R) : a^\top = a\}$.

Proposition 5.11. $\mathsf{Z}_{\operatorname{Sym}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{1-q^{-d}T}{(1-T)^2}$.

Proof. This proof is similar to that of Proposition 5.9 and we use the same notation. By considering the images of the first unit vector in $\mathfrak{O}^d$ under the matrices e_{11} and $e_{1j} + e_{j1}$ $(2 \leqslant j \leqslant d)$, we find that $\operatorname{gor}(\operatorname{Sym}_d(\mathfrak{O})) = d$. Given $z_1, \ldots, z_\ell$, recursively define

$$m'(z_1, \ldots, z_\ell) := \left[\begin{array}{c|ccc} z_1 & & & \\ z_2 & z_1 & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ z_\ell & & & z_1 \\ \hline 0 & & & \\ \vdots & & m'(z_2, \ldots, z_\ell) & \\ 0 & & & \end{array}\right].$$

An induction similar to the one in the proof of Proposition 5.9 shows that $X_1^i, \dots, X_d^i$ are $i \times i$ minors of $m'(X_1, \dots, X_d)$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$. As $\boldsymbol{X} \cdot \mathrm{Sym}_d(\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}])$ is the row span of $m'(X_1, \dots, X_d)$ over $\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}]$, the claim follows from Lemma 5.5 and Corollary 5.4. ⧫

Proposition 5.12. $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{sp}_{2d}(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{gl}_{2d}(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{1-q^{-2d}T}{(1-T)^2}$.

Proof. We proceed along the same lines as the preceding two proofs. Let e_{ij} denote the usual elementary matrix, now of size $2d \times 2d$. Using these matrices, it is easy to see that $(1, 0, \dots, 0) \cdot \mathfrak{sp}_{2d}(\mathfrak{O}) = \mathfrak{O}^{2d}$ whence $\mathrm{gor}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2d}(\mathfrak{O})) = 2d$. As an $\mathfrak{O}$-module, $\mathfrak{sp}_{2d}(\mathfrak{O})$ is generated by the following matrices: (i) $e_{ij} - e_{d+j,d+i}$ $(1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant d)$, (ii) $e_{i,d+i}$, $e_{d+i,i}$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant d)$, and (iii) $e_{i,d+j}+e_{j,d+i}$, $e_{d+i,j}+e_{d+j,i}$ $(1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant d)$. Write $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ and $\boldsymbol{X}' = (X_1', \dots, X_d')$. Define $m'(z_1, \dots, z_\ell)$ as in the proof of Proposition 5.11. Then $(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}') \cdot \mathfrak{sp}_{2d}(\mathfrak{O}[\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}'])$ is generated by the rows of

$$\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}') := \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} X_1 & & & -X_1' & & \\ & \ddots & & \vdots & & \\ & & X_1 & -X_d' & & \\ \hline & \vdots & & & \ddots & \\ \hline X_d & & & & & -X_1' \\ & \ddots & & & & \vdots \\ & & X_d & & & -X_d' \\ \hline\hline & & & & m'(\boldsymbol{X}) & \\ \hline & m'(\boldsymbol{X}') & & & & \end{array}\right].$$

Using what we have shown about the minors of $m'(\boldsymbol{X})$ in the proof of Proposition 5.11, we conclude that X_i^j and $(X_i')^j$ $(i = 1, \dots, d; j = 1, \dots, 2d)$ arise as $j \times j$ minors of $\tilde{m}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}')$. Again, the claim thus follows from Lemma 5.5 and Corollary 5.4. ⧫

In contrast to the above examples, neither $\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ nor $\mathfrak{tr}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ (for $d > 1$) is O-maximal.

Proposition 5.13.

(i) $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{(1-T)^{d-1}}{(1-qT)^d}$.

(ii) $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{tr}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}_{d+1}(\mathfrak{O})}(q^{-1}T) = \frac{(1-q^{-1}T)^d}{(1-T)^{d+1}}$.

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{n}_{d+1}(\mathfrak{O})$ is obtained from $\mathfrak{tr}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ by adding a zero row and a zero column, by Corollary 3.6, it suffices to prove (i). Let $\boldsymbol{e}_i$ denote the ith unit vector in $\mathfrak{O}^d$ and let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^d \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\boldsymbol{x}\,\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ is generated by

$$\Big\{(0, x_1, 0, \dots, 0),\ (0, 0, \gcd(x_1, x_2), 0, \dots, 0),\ \dots,\ (0, \dots, 0, \gcd(x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}))\Big\};$$

in particular, $\mathrm{gor}(\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})) = d - 1$. Moreover, by (4.6) and Lemma 5.2,

$$\mathrm{O}_{\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(\boldsymbol{x}, y) = |y|^{1-d} \cdot \|x_1, y\| \cdot \|x_1, x_2, y\| \cdots \|x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}, y\|.$$

Hence, using (4.6) and Lemma 5.6, $(1 - q^{-1})\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(q^{-s}) = F_{d-1}(s - 2, -1, \dots, -1)$. ⧫

5.4 Diagonal matrices

Let $\mathfrak{d}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ be the subalgebra of diagonal matrices. Clearly $\mathfrak{d}_1(\mathfrak{O}) = \mathfrak{gl}_1(\mathfrak{O})$ so that $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{d}_1(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{1-q^{-1}T}{(1-T)^2}$. It turns out that the functions $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{d}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$ have essentially been computed by Brenti [9, Thm 3.4] in a different context; the author is grateful to Angela Carnevale for pointing this out. We first recall some terminology. Let $\mathrm{B}_n = \{\pm 1\} \wr \mathrm{S}_n$ be the group of signed permutations on n letters, regarded as a subgroup of the symmetric group on $\{\pm 1, \dots, \pm n\}$. For $\sigma \in \mathrm{B}_n$, let $\mathrm{d_B}(\sigma) := \#\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : (i-1)^\sigma > i^\sigma\}$ (where we wrote $0^\sigma = 0$), $\mathrm{N}(\sigma) := \#\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : i^\sigma < 0\}$, and $B_n(X, Y) := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{B}_n} X^{\mathrm{N}(\sigma)} Y^{\mathrm{d_B}(\sigma)}$.

Theorem 5.14 ([9, Thm 3.4(ii)])**.** $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (i(X+1)+1)^n Y^i = \frac{B_n(X,Y)}{(1-Y)^{n+1}}$ *for* $n \geqslant 1$.

The following marks a departure from the simplicity of previous examples of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$.

Corollary 5.15. $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{d}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{B_d(-q^{-1},T)}{(1-T)^{d+1}}$.

Proof. By Corollary 3.6, $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{d}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$ is the dth Hadamard power of $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{d}_1(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$. Since $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{d}_1(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \frac{1-q^{-1}T}{(1-T)^2} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}(1 + i - iq^{-1})T^i$, the claim follows from Theorem 5.14. ♦

Example 5.16.

(i) $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{d}_2(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \dfrac{1 + T - 4q^{-1}T + q^{-2}T^2 + q^{-2}T}{(1-T)^3}$.

(ii) $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{d}_3(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \dfrac{1 + 4T - 12q^{-1}T + 6q^{-2}T - q^{-3}T + T^2 - 6q^{-1}T^2 + 12q^{-2}T^2 - q^{-3}T^3 - 4q^{-3}T^2}{(1-T)^4}$.

We note that permutation statistics have previously featured in explicit formulae for representation zeta functions [10, 61]; see also [11].

6 Constant rank spaces

By a **constant rank space** over a field F, we mean a subspace $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(F)$ such that all non-zero elements of M have the same rank, say r; we then say that M has constant rank r. Such spaces have been studied extensively in the literature (see e.g. [4, 7, 39, 64, 70]), often in the context of vector bundles on projective space. A problem of particular interest is to find, for given d and r, the largest possible dimension of a subspace of $\mathrm{M}_d(\mathbf{C})$ of constant rank r. Apart from trivial examples such as band matrices (see Example 6.6 below), the construction of constant rank spaces (in particular those of large dimension) seems to be challenging. Note that if $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathbf{F}_q)$ has constant rank r and dimension ℓ, then

$$\mathrm{ask}(M) = q^{-\ell}(q^d + (q^\ell - 1)q^{d-r}) = q^{d-\ell} + q^{d-r} - q^{d-\ell-r}. \tag{6.1}$$

In §6.1, we consider a natural analogue, K-minimality, of the concept of O-maximality introduced and studied in §5.1. We then derive conceptual interpretations of both of these notions in a global setting in §6.2—in particular, we will see that K-minimality is closely related to constant rank spaces.

6.1 K-minimality

Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field K of arbitrary characteristic. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ be a submodule. Recall the definition of K_M from Definition 4.4.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $F\colon \mathfrak{O}^\ell \to M$ be an $\mathfrak{O}$-module isomorphism, $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathfrak{O}^\ell \setminus \{0\}$, and $y \in \mathfrak{O} \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\mathrm{K}_M(F(\boldsymbol{w}), y) \geqslant |y|^{\mathrm{grk}(M)-d}\|\boldsymbol{w}, y\|^{-\mathrm{grk}(M)}$.*

Proof. Let $a := F(\boldsymbol{w})$ have equivalence type $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$ (see §4.3.1); of course, $r \leqslant \mathrm{grk}(M)$. Let $m := \min(\nu(w_1), \dots, \nu(w_\ell))$, $n = \nu(y)$, and $a := F(\boldsymbol{w})$. Then $m \leqslant \min(\nu(a_{ij}) : 1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant d) = \lambda_1 \leqslant \lambda_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \lambda_r$ and Lemma 4.6(iii) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{K}_M(F(\boldsymbol{w}), y) &\geqslant q^{r\min(m,n)+(d-r)n} \geqslant q^{\mathrm{grk}(M)\min(m,n)+(d-\mathrm{grk}(M))n}\\ &= |y|^{\mathrm{grk}(M)-d}\|\boldsymbol{w}, y\|^{-\mathrm{grk}(M)}.\end{aligned}$$

♦

Definition 6.2. We say that M is **K-minimal** if there exists an $\mathfrak{O}$-module isomorphism $F\colon \mathfrak{O}^\ell \to M$ such that $\mathrm{K}_M(F(\boldsymbol{w}), y) = |y|^{\mathrm{grk}(M)-d}\|\boldsymbol{w}, y\|^{-\mathrm{grk}(M)}$ for all $(\boldsymbol{w}, y) \in \mathfrak{O}^\ell \times \mathfrak{O}$ outside a set of measure zero.

Clearly, if $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^n$ and $a \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathfrak{O})$, then $\|\boldsymbol{x}a\| = \|x\|$. We conclude that if the condition in the preceding definition is satisfied for some isomorphism $F\colon \mathfrak{O}^\ell \to M$, then it holds for all of them. By the elementary divisor theorem we may thus characterise K-minimality as follows.

Lemma 6.3. *M is K-minimal if and only if M is an isolated submodule of $\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$ and $\mathrm{K}_M(a, y) = |y|^{\mathrm{grk}(M)-d}\|a, y\|^{-\mathrm{grk}(M)}$ for all $(a, y) \in M \times \mathfrak{O}$ outside a set of measure zero.*

Lemma 5.6 now implies the following.

Proposition 6.4. *Let M be K-minimal. Let $r = \mathrm{grk}(M)$ and $\ell = \dim_K(M \otimes K)$. Then*

$$\mathsf{Z}_M(T) = \frac{1 - q^{d-\ell-r}T}{(1 - q^{d-\ell}T)(1 - q^{d-r}T)}.$$

♦

The following sufficient condition for K-minimality is proved similarly to Lemma 5.5.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $(a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$ be an $\mathfrak{O}$-basis of M. Suppose that for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant \mathrm{grk}(M)$, the ideal generated by the $i \times i$ minors of $X_1a_1 + \cdots + X_\ell a_\ell \in \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O}[X_1, \dots, X_\ell])$ contains $X_1^i, \dots, X_\ell^i$. Then M is K-minimal.* ♦

Example 6.6 (Band matrices)**.** Let $r \geqslant 1$ and define

$$B_r = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & & \\ x_2 & \ddots & \\ \vdots & \ddots & x_1 \\ x_r & \vdots & x_2 \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & x_r \end{bmatrix} : x_1, \dots, x_r \in \mathfrak{O} \right\} \subset \mathrm{M}_{(2r-1)\times r}(\mathfrak{O}).$$

By Lemma 6.5 and Proposition 6.4 (with $d = 2r - 1$ and $\ell = r$), $\mathsf{Z}_{B_r}(T) = \frac{1-q^{-1}T}{(1-q^{r-1}T)^2}$.

6.2 A global interpretation

Henceforth, let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$; recall the notation from §3.3. Let $\bar{k}$ be an algebraic closure of k. Let $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{o})$ be a submodule. The following can be proved similarly to Proposition 4.8 (and Proposition 4.12).

Lemma 6.7.

(i) $\max\limits_{a\in M} \mathrm{rk}_k(a) = \max\limits_{\bar{a}\in M\otimes_{\mathfrak{o}}\bar{k}} \mathrm{rk}_{\bar{k}}(\bar{a}) = \mathrm{grk}(M_v)$ *for all* $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$.

(ii) $\max\limits_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathfrak{o}^d} \dim_k(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot(M\otimes_{\mathfrak{o}} k)) = \max\limits_{\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}\in\bar{k}^d} \dim_{\bar{k}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}\cdot(M\otimes_{\mathfrak{o}}\bar{k})) = \mathrm{gor}(M_v)$ *for all* $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$. ♦

Extending Definitions 3.2 and 4.7, we let $\mathrm{grk}(M)$ and $\mathrm{gor}(M)$ be the common number in (i) and (ii), respectively. K-minimality is closely related to constant rank spaces:

Proposition 6.8.

(i) Let $(a_1,\dots,a_\ell) \subset M$ *be a* k*-basis of* $M\otimes_{\mathfrak{o}} k$. *Let* I_i *be the ideal of* $k[X_1,\dots,X_\ell]$ *generated by the* $i\times i$ *minors of* $X_1a_1+\cdots+X_\ell a_\ell$. *Then* $M\otimes_{\mathfrak{o}}\bar{k}$ *is a constant rank space if and only if* $X_1^i,\dots,X_d^i \in I_i$ *for* $i = 1,\dots,\mathrm{grk}(M)$.

(ii) If $M\otimes_{\mathfrak{o}}\bar{k}$ *is a constant rank space, then* M_v *is* K*-minimal for almost all* $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$.

Our proof of Proposition 6.8 relies on the following observation.

Lemma 6.9. *Let* F *be a field. Let* $I = \langle f_1,\dots,f_r\rangle \lhd F[\boldsymbol{X}] = F[X_1,\dots,X_d]$, *where each* f_i *is homogeneous of degree* n. *Suppose that* $\sqrt{I} = \langle X_1,\dots,X_d\rangle$. *Then* $X_1^n,\dots,X_d^n \in I$.

Proof. It clearly suffices to show that $X_d^n \in I$. We freely use basic facts from the theory of Gröbner bases; see e.g. [14]. Throughout, we consider the lexicographic monomial order with $X_d \prec \cdots \prec X_1$. Let $\mathrm{lt}(f)$ denote the leading term of a non-zero $f \in F[\boldsymbol{X}]$. Let G be the reduced Gröbner basis of I. Since each f_i is homogeneous of degree n, Buchberger's algorithm and the uniqueness of G show that each element of G is also homogeneous of degree n. As I is 0-dimensional, we may write $G = \{g_1,\dots,g_\ell\}$ such that $g_i \in F[X_i,\dots,X_d]$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$ and such that each $\mathrm{lt}(g_i)$ is a power of X_i; since g_i is homogeneous of degree n, $\mathrm{lt}(g_i) = X_i^n$. Since $X_d \in \sqrt{I}$, there exists $m \geqslant 1$ with $X_d^m \in I$. The multivariate division algorithm modulo G thus reduces X_d^m to 0. As G is reduced, the only element of G whose leading term is a power of X_d is g_d. Since the latter belongs to $F[X_d]$, the division algorithm actually takes places within $F[X_d]$ whence X_d^m is divisible by g_d. This only leaves the possibility $g_d = X_d^n \in I$. ♦

Proof of Proposition 6.8.

(i) Let $\mathbf{V}(I) \subset \bar{k}^\ell$ be the algebraic set corresponding to $I \lhd k[\boldsymbol{X}] := k[X_1,\dots,X_\ell]$ and let $r = \mathrm{grk}(M)$. Then $M\otimes_{\mathfrak{o}}\bar{k}$ is a constant rank space if and only if $\mathbf{V}(I_i) \subset \{0\}$ for $i = 1,\dots,r$ which, by Hilbert's Nullstellensatz, is equivalent to $\sqrt{I_i} \supset \langle X_1,\dots,X_r\rangle$ for $i = 1,\dots,r$. By the preceding lemma, $X_j \in \sqrt{I_i}$ if and only if $X_j^i \in I_i$.

(ii) Lemma 5.5 shows that (i) implies (ii); note that if $f \in \mathfrak{o}[\boldsymbol{X}]$ belongs to the $k[\boldsymbol{X}]$-ideal generated by $g_1, \dots, g_r \in \mathfrak{o}[\boldsymbol{X}]$, then f also belongs to the $\mathfrak{o}_v[\boldsymbol{X}]$-ideal generated by the g_i, at least for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$. ♦

In view of Lemma 2.1, we say that a subspace $M' \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(F)$ (where F is a field) has **constant orbit dimension** if all F-spaces $\boldsymbol{x}M'$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \in F^d \setminus \{0\}$ have the same dimension. The following counterpart of Proposition 6.8 is then proved in the same way.

Proposition 6.10. *Let $(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) \subset M$ be a k-basis of $M \otimes_{\mathfrak{o}} k$. Let J_i be the ideal of $k[\boldsymbol{X}] := k[X_1, \dots, X_\ell]$ generated by the $i \times i$ minors of*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{X}a_1 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{X}a_\ell \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $M \otimes_{\mathfrak{o}} \bar{k}$ has constant orbit dimension if and only if $X_1^i, \dots, X_d^i \in J_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, \mathrm{gor}(M)$. In that case, M_v is O*-maximal for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$.* ♦

7 Orbits and conjugacy classes of linear groups

In this section, we use p-adic Lie theory to relate ask, orbit-counting, and conjugacy class zeta functions. In §7.1, we recall properties of saturable pro-p groups and Lie algebras. In §7.2, we prove that orbit-counting zeta functions over $\mathbf{Z}_p$ are rational. In §7.3 we compare group stabilisers and Lie centralisers under suitable hypotheses and this allows us to deduce Theorem 1.6 in §7.4. Finally, in §7.5, we prove Theorem 1.7.

7.1 Reminder: saturable pro-p groups and Lie algebras

We briefly recall Lazard's [48] notion of (p-)saturability of groups and Lie algebras using González-Sánchez's [30] equivalent formulation.

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie $\mathbf{Z}_p$-algebra whose underlying $\mathbf{Z}_p$-module is free of finite rank. A **potent filtration** of $\mathfrak{g}$ is a central series $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \supset \mathfrak{g}_2 \supset \cdots$ of ideals (i.e. $[\mathfrak{g}_i, \mathfrak{g}] \subset \mathfrak{g}_{i+1}$ for all i) with $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{g}_i = 0$ and such that $[\mathfrak{g}_{i,p-1}, \mathfrak{g}] := [\mathfrak{g}_i, \underbrace{\mathfrak{g}, \dots, \mathfrak{g}}_{p-1}] := [\dots[[\mathfrak{g}_i, \mathfrak{g}], \mathfrak{g}], \dots, \mathfrak{g}] \subset p\mathfrak{g}_{i+1}$ for all $i \geqslant 1$. We say that $\mathfrak{g}$ is **saturable** if it admits a potent filtration.

Proposition 7.1. *(*[1, Prop. 2.3]*) Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field K of characteristic zero and residue characteristic p. Let e denote the ramification index of $K/\mathbf{Q}_p$. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie $\mathfrak{O}$-algebra whose underlying $\mathfrak{O}$-module is free of finite rank. Let $m > \frac{e}{p-1}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}^m$ $(= \mathfrak{P}^m\mathfrak{g})$ is saturable as a $\mathbf{Z}_p$-algebra.*

We note that, as before, subalgebras of an $\mathfrak{O}$-algebra are understood to be $\mathfrak{O}$-subalgebras; whenever we consider $\mathbf{Z}_p$-subalgebras, we will explicitly state as much.

Similarly to the case of Lie algebras, a torsion-free finitely generated pro-p group G which admits a central series $G = G_1 \geqslant G_2 \geqslant \cdots$ of closed subgroups with $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i = 1$ and $[G_{i,p-1}\, G] \leqslant G_{i+1}^p$ is **saturable**.

If $\mathfrak{g}$ is a saturable Lie $\mathbf{Z}_p$-algebra, then the underlying topological space of $\mathfrak{g}$ can be endowed with the structure of a saturable pro-p group using the Hausdorff series. Conversely, every saturable pro-p group gives rise to a saturable Lie $\mathbf{Z}_p$-algebra and these two functorial operations furnish mutually quasi-inverse equivalences between the categories of saturable Lie $\mathbf{Z}_p$-algebras and saturable pro-p groups (defined as full subcategories of all Lie $\mathbf{Z}_p$-algebras and pro-p groups, respectively); see [30, §4] for an overview and [48, Ch. 4] for details. While the general interplay between subalgebras and subgroups is subtle, we note the following fact.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a saturable Lie $\mathbf{Z}_p$-algebra and let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a saturable subalgebra of finite additive index. Let G and H be the saturable pro-p groups associated with $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ via the Hausdorff series (so that $H \leqslant G$). Then $|G : H| = |\mathfrak{g} : \mathfrak{h}|$.*

Proof. This can be proved in the same way as [31, Lem. 3.2(4)]. ⧫

7.2 Orbits of p-adic linear groups

Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field K. Recall that $\mathfrak{P}$ denotes the maximal ideal of $\mathfrak{O}$ and that q and p denote the size and characteristic of the residue field of K, respectively. Further recall the definition of $\mathsf{Z}_G^{\mathsf{oc}}(T)$ (Definition 1.2(ii)). Although we will not need it in the sequel, since it might be of independent interest, we note the following rationality statement for $\mathsf{Z}_G^{\mathsf{oc}}(T)$, a consequence of a powerful model-theoretic result due to Cluckers [37, App. A].

Theorem 7.3. *Let $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbf{Z}_p)$. Then $\mathsf{Z}_G(T) \in \mathbf{Q}(T)$. More precisely, there are $a_1, \ldots, a_r \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_r \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\prod_{i=1}^r (1 - p^{a_i} T^{b_i}) \mathsf{Z}_G^{\mathsf{oc}}(T) \in \mathbf{Q}[T]$.*

Lemma. *Let $\bar{G}$ be the closure of $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ in $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$. Then $\mathsf{Z}_{\bar{G}}^{\mathsf{oc}}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_G^{\mathsf{oc}}(T)$.*

Proof. The $\mathrm{GL}_d^i(\mathfrak{O})$ form a fundamental system of neighbourhoods of the identity whence the claim follows from $G \cdot \mathrm{GL}_d^i(\mathfrak{O}) = \bar{G} \cdot \mathrm{GL}_d^i(\mathfrak{O})$ for all $i \geqslant 0$. ⧫

Proof of Theorem 7.3. Define an equivalence relation $\sim_n$ on $\mathbf{Z}_p^d$ via

$$\boldsymbol{x} \sim_n \boldsymbol{y} \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \exists g \in G.\, \boldsymbol{x} \equiv \boldsymbol{y} g \pmod{p^n}.$$

Our theorem will follow immediately from [37, Thm A.2] once we have established that $\sim_n$ is definable (uniformly in n) in the subanalytic language used in [37, App. A]. By the preceding lemma, we may assume that $G = \bar{G}$. It then follows from the well-known structure theory of p-adic analytic groups (see [19, 48]) that there exists an open saturable (or, more restrictively, uniform) subgroup $H \leqslant G$ of the form $H = \exp(p^2 \mathfrak{h})$, where

$\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathbf{Z}_p)$ is a suitable saturable (or uniform) $\mathbf{Z}_p$-subalgebra. Let T be a transversal for the right cosets of H in G. Then, for $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbf{Z}_p^d$, $\boldsymbol{x} \sim_n \boldsymbol{y}$ if and only if

$$\bigvee_{t \in T} \exists a \in \mathfrak{h}.\, \boldsymbol{x} \exp(p^2 a) \equiv \boldsymbol{y} t^{-1} \pmod{p^n}.$$

The claim thus follows since the $d \times d$-matrix exponential $\exp(p^2 X)$ is given by d^2 power series in d^2 variables which all converge on $\mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathbf{Z}_p)$. ♦

Remark 7.4. Let $K/\mathbf{Q}_p$ be a finite extension. Then we may regard $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ as a $\mathbf{Z}_p$-linear group of degree $d|K : \mathbf{Q}_p|$ via the regular representation of $\mathfrak{O}$ over $\mathbf{Z}_p$. In particular, Theorem 7.3 implies that $\mathsf{Z}_G^{\mathsf{oc}}(T)$ is rational provided that $K/\mathbf{Q}_p$ is unramified.

We conclude this subsection with some elementary examples of $\mathsf{Z}_G^{\mathsf{oc}}(T)$.

Example 7.5.

(i) It is easy to see that the rule $\boldsymbol{x} \mapsto \min(\nu(x_1), \ldots, \nu(x_d), n)$ induces a bijection $\mathfrak{O}_n^d / \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \to \{0, \ldots, n\}$ whence

$$\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_{\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})}(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1) T^n = \frac{1}{(1-T)^2}.$$

(ii) Let $p \neq 2$. The number of orbits of $\langle -1 \rangle \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathfrak{O})$ on $\mathfrak{O}_n$ is $1 + (q^n - 1)/2$ so that

$$\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_{\langle -1 \rangle}(T) = \frac{1}{1-T} + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{1-qT} - \frac{1}{1-T}\Big) = \frac{2 - qT - T}{2(1-qT)(1-T)}.$$

(iii) Let $G = \langle \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right] \rangle \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathfrak{O})$. It is easy to see that

$$\mathsf{Z}_G^{\mathsf{oc}}(T) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{q^n(q^n+1)}{2} T^n = \frac{2 - q^2 T - qT}{2(1-q^2T)(1-qT)}.$$

7.3 Lie centralisers and group stabilisers

Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field $K \supset \mathbf{Q}_p$. Let e denote the ramification index of $K/\mathbf{Q}_p$. As expected, for suitable matrix algebras and groups, the equivalence between saturable pro-p groups and Lie $\mathbf{Z}_p$-algebras recalled in §7.1 can be made explicit using exponentials and logarithms.

In line with our previous notation (see §3.5), we write $\mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O}) := \{a \in \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O}) : a \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^m}\}$. Moreover, we define $\mathrm{GL}_d^m(\mathfrak{O}) := \{a \in \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O}) : a \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^m}\}$.

Proposition 7.6 ([44, Lem. B.1])**.** *Let $m > \frac{e}{p-1}$. The formal exponential and logarithm series converge on $\mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$ and $\mathrm{GL}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$, respectively, and define mutually inverse bijections* $\exp\colon \mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O}) \to \mathrm{GL}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$ *and* $\log\colon \mathrm{GL}_d^m(\mathfrak{O}) \to \mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$.

Hence, if $m > \frac{e}{p-1}$ and $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$ is a saturable subalgebra, then we may identify the saturable pro-p group associated with $\mathfrak{g}$ in the sense of §7.1 with $\exp(\mathfrak{g}) \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$.

For $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^d$ and $n \geqslant 0$, we write $\boldsymbol{x} \bmod \mathfrak{P}^n$ for the image of $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\mathfrak{O}_n^d$.

Lemma 7.7. *Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d^e(\mathfrak{O})$ $(= p\,\mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O}))$ be a saturable subalgebra. Then*

$$\mathrm{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\boldsymbol{x} \bmod \mathfrak{P}^n) = \{a \in \mathfrak{g} : \boldsymbol{x}a \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^n}\}$$

is a saturable subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^d$.

Proof. Write $\mathfrak{c}^n := \mathrm{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\boldsymbol{x} \bmod \mathfrak{P}^n)$; obviously, $\mathfrak{c}^n$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \gamma_1(\mathfrak{g}) \supset \gamma_2(\mathfrak{g}) \supset \cdots$ be the lower central series of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\gamma_p(\mathfrak{c}^n) \subset \mathfrak{c}^{n+e}$. Indeed, each element, a say, of $\gamma_p(\mathfrak{c}^n)$ is a sum of matrix products $c(ph)$ for suitable $c \in \mathfrak{c}^n$ and $h \in \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ and clearly, $\boldsymbol{x}c(ph) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^{n+e}}$. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \supset \mathfrak{g}_2 \supset \cdots$ be a potent filtration of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then $\mathfrak{c}^n = \mathfrak{c}^n \cap \mathfrak{g}_1 \supset \mathfrak{c}^n \cap \mathfrak{g}_2 \supset \cdots$ is a central series of $\mathfrak{c}^n$ with $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (\mathfrak{c}^n \cap \mathfrak{g}_i) = 0$. It is in fact a potent filtration for $p\mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{c}^{n+e} = p\mathfrak{c}^n$ whence $[(\mathfrak{c}^n \cap \mathfrak{g}_i), {}_{p-1}\,\mathfrak{c}^n] \subset p\mathfrak{g}_{i+1} \cap \gamma_p(\mathfrak{c}^n) \subset p\mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{c}^{n+e} = p\mathfrak{c}^n$. ♦

Lemma 7.8. *Let $m > \frac{e}{p-1}$ and $a \in \mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$. Then there exists $u \in \mathrm{GL}_d^1(\mathfrak{O})$ with $\exp(a) = 1 + au$.*

Proof. Let $g(X) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(i+1)!} X^i$ so that $\exp(X) = 1 + Xg(x)$ in $\mathbf{Q}[\![X]\!]$. Let $a \in \mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$ be non-zero. Let b be an entry of a of minimal valuation. Then $\nu_K(b^i/(i+1)!)$ is a lower bound for the valuation of each entry of $\frac{1}{(i+1)!}a^i$ for $i \geqslant 0$. It is well-known that $\nu_p((i+1)!) \leqslant i/(p-1)$ (see e.g. [12, Lem. 4.2.8(1)]) so that $\nu_K((i+1)!) \leqslant ei/(p-1)$. Therefore, $\nu_K(b^i/(i+1)!) \geqslant i(\nu_K(b) - e/(p-1)) =: f(i)$. Clearly, $f(i) \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$ and $f(i) > 0$ for $i > 0$. Hence, $g(a)$ converges in $\mathrm{M}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ to an element of $\mathrm{GL}_d^1(\mathfrak{O})$. ♦

By combining the preceding two lemmas, we obtain the following.

Corollary 7.9. *Let $m > \max(e-1, \frac{e}{p-1})$, let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$ be a saturable subalgebra, and let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^d$. Then $\exp(\mathrm{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\boldsymbol{x} \bmod \mathfrak{P}^n)) = \mathrm{St}_{\exp(\mathfrak{g})}(\boldsymbol{x} \bmod \mathfrak{P}^n)$.*

Proof. Let $a \in \mathfrak{g}$ and write $\exp(a) = 1 + au$ for $u \in \mathrm{GL}_d^1(\mathfrak{O})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a \in \mathrm{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\boldsymbol{x} \bmod \mathfrak{P}^n) &\Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{x}a \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^n} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{x}au \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^n} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{x}\exp(a) \equiv \boldsymbol{x}(1+au) \equiv \boldsymbol{x} \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^n} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exp(a) \in \mathrm{St}_{\exp(\mathfrak{g})}(\boldsymbol{x} \bmod \mathfrak{P}^n). \end{aligned}$$ ♦

7.4 Proof of Theorem 1.6

Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a non-Archimedean local field $K \supset \mathbf{Q}_p$ and let e be the ramification index of $K/\mathbf{Q}_p$.

Proposition 7.10. *Let $m > \max(e-1, \frac{e}{p-1})$, let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d^m(\mathfrak{O})$ be a saturable subalgebra, and let $G = \exp(\mathfrak{g})$. Then $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_G^{\mathsf{oc}}(T)$.*

Proof. Write $V = \mathfrak{O}^d$ and $V_n = V \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$. Recall that $\mathfrak{g}_n$ denotes the image of $\mathfrak{g}$ under the natural map $\mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \to \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O}_n)$. For $n \geqslant 0$, by combining Lemma 2.1, Lemma 7.2, and Corollary 7.9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |V_n/G| &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V_n} |\boldsymbol{x}G|^{-1} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V_n} |G : \mathrm{St}_G(\boldsymbol{x})|^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V_n} |\mathfrak{g} : \mathrm{c}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\boldsymbol{x})|^{-1} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V_n} |\mathfrak{g}_n : \mathrm{c}_{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\boldsymbol{x})|^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in V_n} |\boldsymbol{x}\,\mathfrak{g}_n|^{-1} = \mathrm{ask}(\mathfrak{g}_n \mid V_n). \end{aligned}$$

♦

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $m > \max(e-1, \frac{e}{p-1})$. Propositions 3.9 and 7.10 show that $q^{dm}\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^m_{\mathfrak{g}^m}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc},m}_{\exp(\mathfrak{g}^m)}(T) \in \mathbf{Z}[\![T]\!]$. ♦

7.5 Orbits and conjugacy classes of unipotent groups

Let $\mathfrak{O}$ be the valuation ring of a finite extension $K/\mathbf{Q}_p$. Recall that $\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O}) \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ is the Lie algebra of all strictly upper triangular matrices and that U_d denotes the group scheme of upper unitriangular $d \times d$ matrices. The following is well-known.

Proposition 7.11. *Let $p \geqslant d$.*

(i) All $\mathbf{Z}_p$-subalgebras of $\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ and closed subgroups of $\mathrm{U}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ are saturable.

(ii) exp *and* log *define polynomial bijections between $\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ and $\mathrm{U}_d(\mathfrak{O})$.*

Proof. Noting that subalgebras of $\mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ and closed subgroups of $\mathrm{U}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ are nilpotent of class at most $d-1 < p$, their lower central series constitute potent filtrations. This proves (i). Part (ii) follows since $a^d = 0$ for $a \in \mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{O})$. ♦

A simple variation of Proposition 7.11 yields the following.

Corollary 7.12. *Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ be a subalgebra. Suppose that $\mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent of class at most c and that $a^{c+1} = 0$ (in $\mathrm{M}_d(\mathfrak{O})$) for all $a \in \mathfrak{g}$. Further suppose that $p > c$.*

(i) $\mathfrak{g}$ is saturable.

(ii) $G := \exp(\mathfrak{g})$ is a saturable subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$.

(iii) exp *and* log *define mutually inverse polynomial bijections between $\mathfrak{g}$ and G.* ♦

By going through the proof of Theorem 1.6, we now easily obtain the following.

Corollary 7.13. *Let the notation be as in Corollary 7.12. Then $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_{\exp(\mathfrak{g})}(T)$ and thus, in particular, $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T) \in \mathbf{Z}[\![T]\!]$.* ♦

This proves the first part of Theorem 1.7. We note that Corollary 5.15 shows that we may not, in general, relax the assumptions in Corollary 7.13 and merely assume that $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ is a nilpotent subalgebra. The following completes the proof of Theorem 1.7.

Proposition 7.14. *Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$ be an isolated subalgebra consisting of nilpotent matrices. Suppose that $p \geqslant d$. Then $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\exp(\mathfrak{g})}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g})}(T)$.*

Proof. By Engel's theorem, $\mathfrak{g}$ is $\mathrm{GL}_d(K)$-conjugate to a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{n}_d(K)$ and hence nilpotent of class at most $d-1$; in particular, $\mathrm{ad}(a)^d = 0$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{g}$. By Corollary 7.12, $G := \exp(\mathfrak{g})$ is a saturable subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O})$.

Let $\mathrm{Ad}\colon G \to \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{g})$ denote the adjoint representation of G; hence, $\mathrm{Ad}(g)\colon \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}$, $a \mapsto \log(\exp(a)^g) = a^g$ for $g \in G$. Recall that G_n denotes the image of G in $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathfrak{O}_n)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_n$ that of $\mathfrak{g}$ in $\mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O}_n)$. Clearly, $a \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^n}$ if and only if $\exp(a) \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}^n}$ for $a \in \mathfrak{g}$. We may thus identify conjugacy classes of G_n with $\mathrm{Ad}(G)$-orbits on $\mathfrak{g}_n$. As $\mathfrak{g}$ is isolated within $\mathfrak{gl}_d(\mathfrak{O})$, we may identify $\mathfrak{g}_n = \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathfrak{O}_n$ and obtain $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{G}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_{\mathrm{Ad}(G)\curvearrowright\mathfrak{g}}(T)$.

By Corollary 7.12, $\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a saturable subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})$. The Hausdorff series shows that $\log(\exp(b)^{\exp(a)}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!}[b,_i\, a]$ for $a, b \in \mathfrak{g}$ (see [31, Eqn (3)]) whence $\mathrm{Ad}(\exp(a)) = \exp(\mathrm{ad}(a))$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{g}$. Thus, $\mathrm{Ad}(G) = \exp(\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g}))$ and Corollary 7.13 shows that $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_{\mathrm{Ad}(G)\curvearrowright\mathfrak{g}}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\log(\mathrm{Ad}(G))\curvearrowright\mathfrak{g}}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g})\curvearrowright\mathfrak{g}}(T)$. ♦

Using the well-known equivalence between unipotent algebraic groups and nilpotent finite-dimensional Lie algebras over a field of characteristic zero (see [16, Ch. IV]), Corollary 7.13 and Proposition 7.14 now imply the following global result.

Corollary 7.15. *Let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$. Let $\mathbf{G} \leqslant \mathrm{U}_d \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} k$ be a unipotent algebraic group over k and let $\mathsf{G} \leqslant \mathrm{U}_d \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathfrak{o}$ be the associated $\mathfrak{o}$-form of $\mathbf{G}$ (i.e. the schematic closure of $\mathbf{G}$). Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{n}_d(k)$ be the Lie algebra of $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g} \cap \mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{o})$. Then for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$, $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{o}_v)}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\mathfrak{g}_v}(T)$ and $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{o}_v)}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{ask}}_{\mathrm{ad}(\mathfrak{g}_v)}(T)$.* ♦

Note, in particular, that Theorem 4.15 therefore establishes functional equations for orbit-counting and conjugacy class zeta functions arising from unipotent algebraic groups.

Corollary 7.16. *Let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$. Let $\mathbf{G} \leqslant \mathrm{U}_d \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} k$ and $\mathbf{H} \leqslant \mathrm{U}_e \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} k$ be unipotent algebraic groups over k with $\mathfrak{o}$-forms G and H as above. Suppose that for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$, $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{o}_v)}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{H}(\mathfrak{o}_v)}(T)$. Then $\dim_k(\mathbf{G}) = \dim_k(\mathbf{H})$.*

Proof. Theorem 4.15, Corollary 7.15, and [56, §5] allow us to recover $\dim_k(\mathbf{G})$ from $\left(\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{o}_v)}(T)\right)_{v \in \mathcal{V}_k \setminus S}$ for any finite set $S \subset \mathcal{V}_k$. ♦

We note that there are examples of non-isomorphic groups $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ (of the same dimension) which satisfy $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{o}_v)}(T) = \mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{H}(\mathfrak{o}_v)}(T)$ for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$; see Table 2 in §8.3.

8 Further examples

8.1 Computer calculations: Zeta

The author's software package Zeta [59] for Sage [62] can compute numerous types of "generic local" zeta functions in fortunate ("non-degenerate") cases. The techniques used by Zeta were developed over the course of several papers; see [57] for an overview and references to other pieces of software that Zeta relies upon. When performing

computations, Zeta proceeds by attempting to explicitly compute certain types of p-adic integrals. Fortunately, the integrals in (4.3) and (4.6) can both be encoded in terms of the "representation data" introduced in [58, §5] whence the author's computational techniques apply verbatim to the functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ for $\mathfrak{O} = \mathbf{Z}$. In detail, given a submodule $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathbf{Z})$, Zeta can be used to attempt to construct a rational function $W(X,T) \in \mathbf{Q}(X,T)$ with the following property: for almost all primes p and all finite extensions $K/\mathbf{Q}_p$, $\mathsf{Z}_{M\otimes_{\mathbf{Z}}\mathfrak{O}_K}(T) = W(q_K,T)$; we note that for various reasons, Zeta may well fail to construct $W(X,T)$ even if it exists. Given $M \subset \mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathbf{Z})$, Zeta can also be used to attempt to construct a formula as in Corollary 4.11.

The remainder of this section is devoted to a number of examples of functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ and $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_G(T)$ (via Theorem 1.7) computed with the help of Zeta. Throughout, K is a non-Archimedean local field of characteristic zero with valuation ring $\mathfrak{O}$, residue field size q, and residue characteristic p.

8.2 Examples of ask zeta functions

Example 8.1 (Small poles and unbounded denominators)**.** Let

$$M = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & b & a \\ b & c & d \\ a & d & c \end{bmatrix} : a,b,c,d \in \mathfrak{O} \right\}.$$

Then for sufficiently large p,

$$\mathsf{Z}_M(T) = \frac{1 + 5q^{-1}T - 12q^{-2}T + 5q^{-3}T + q^{-4}T^2}{(1-q^{-1}T)(1-T)^2}.$$

Hence, the real poles of $\zeta_M(s)$ are -1 and 0; it is easy to see that $\mathrm{gor}(M) = 3$ (see Definition 3.2). This example illustrates that, in contrast to the case of $\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$, $d - \mathrm{gor}(M)$ is generally not a lower bound for the real poles of $\zeta_M(s)$. Note that $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ has unbounded denominators—the author has found comparatively few modules of square matrices with this property (and initially suspected they did not exist).

Example 8.2 ($Y^2 = X^3 - X$)**.** Let $c(q)$ denote the number of points in $\mathbf{P}^2(\mathbf{F}_q)$ on the elliptic curve $Y^2 = X^3 - X$. In [20,21], du Sautoy constructed a nilpotent group of Hirsch length 9 whose local (normal) subgroup zeta function at a prime p depends on $c(p)$. Due to the "wild" behaviour of $c(p)$ as a function of p, he thus disproved earlier predictions on the growth of (normal) subgroups of nilpotent groups. His construction has since been used to demonstrate that other group-theoretic counting problems can be "wild" (e.g. the enumeration of representations [68, Ex. 2.4] or of "descendants" [24])—we will now see that the present setting is no exception. Namely, let

$$E = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} z & x & y \\ x & z & 0 \\ y & 0 & x \end{bmatrix} : x,y,z \in \mathfrak{O} \right\}.$$

For sufficiently large p,

$$\mathsf{Z}_E(T) = \frac{1 + (c(q)\cdot q^{-1} - 1 - 2c(q)\cdot q^{-2} + 2q^{-1} + c(q)\cdot q^{-3} - 4q^{-2})T + q^{-3}T^2 + q^{-3}T}{(1-T)^3}.$$

In particular, despite all the examples of functions $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$ that we encountered so far, Corollary 4.11 accurately reflects the general dependence of $\mathsf{Z}_{M_v}(T)$ on a place $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$ for a module of matrices M over the ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$ of a number field k. However, just as in the study of zeta functions of groups, it remains unclear if anything meaningful can be said about the varieties $V_i \otimes_{\mathfrak{o}} k$ "required" to produce formulae (4.4) as M varies over all modules of matrices over $\mathfrak{o}$.

Note that we may derive a group-theoretic counting problem (namely, the enumeration of orbits) from E at the cost of doubling the dimension: for $E^* := \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & E \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right] \leqslant \mathrm{GL}_6(\mathfrak{O})$, the second proof of Lemma 2.1 shows that $\mathsf{Z}_{E^*}(T) = \mathsf{Z}_E(q^3T)$. This construction of a group attached to an elliptic curve previously featured in work of Boston and Isaacs [8] on numbers of conjugacy classes of p-groups of a given order.

Example 8.3. Suppose that $p \neq 2$ and let

$$M = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x_2 & -x_3 & 0 & 0 & x_1 \\ 0 & 0 & x_1 & \frac{x_2}{2} & -\frac{x_3}{2} & x_5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & 0 & x_4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : x_1, \ldots, x_5 \in \mathfrak{O} \right\}.$$

For sufficiently large p,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Z}_M(T) = \big((&+q^{36}T^{19} - 4q^{35}T^{19} - q^{34}T^{20} + q^{35}T^{18} + 8q^{34}T^{19} - 2q^{34}T^{18} - 2q^{33}T^{19} - q^{34}T^{17} \\
&- 6q^{33}T^{18} - q^{32}T^{19} + 3q^{33}T^{17} + 5q^{32}T^{18} + 3q^{32}T^{17} + 6q^{31}T^{18} - q^{32}T^{16} - 12q^{31}T^{17} \\
&- 2q^{30}T^{18} - 9q^{30}T^{17} - q^{31}T^{15} + 14q^{30}T^{16} + 14q^{29}T^{17} + 4q^{30}T^{15} + 5q^{29}T^{16} \\
&- 3q^{28}T^{17} - 14q^{29}T^{15} - 41q^{28}T^{16} + q^{29}T^{14} + 12q^{28}T^{15} + 26q^{27}T^{16} - 2q^{28}T^{14} \\
&+ 46q^{27}T^{15} - 4q^{26}T^{16} - 7q^{27}T^{14} - 73q^{26}T^{15} + 2q^{27}T^{13} - 24q^{26}T^{14} + 32q^{25}T^{15} \\
&- 2q^{26}T^{13} + 103q^{25}T^{14} - 3q^{24}T^{15} + 6q^{25}T^{13} - 98q^2{}4T^{14} - q^2{}5T^1{}2 - 89q^2{}4T^{13} \\
&+ 29q^{23}T^{14} + 8q^{24}T^{12} + 176q^{23}T^1{}3 - 2q^{22}T^1{}4 + 35q^{23}T^{12} - 115q^{22}T^{13} + q^{23}T^{11} \\
&- 178q^{22}T^{12} + 25q^{21}T^{13} - 15q^{22}T^{11} + 223q^{21}T^{12} - 2q^{20}T^{13} + 119q^{21}T^{11} \\
&- 100q^{20}T^{12} + q^{21}T^{10} - 262q^{20}T^{11} + 16q^{19}T^{12} - 39q^{20}T^{10} + 214q^{19}T^{11} - q^{18}T^{12} \\
&+ 176q^{19}T^{10} - 61q^{18}T^{11} + 3q^{19}T^9 - 280q^{18}T^{10} + 3q^{17}T^{11} - 61q^{18}T^9 + 176q^{17}T^{10} \\
&- q^{18}T^8 + 214q^{17}T^9 - 39q^{16}T^{10} + 16q^{17}T^8 - 262q^{16}T^9 + q^{15}T^{10} - 100q^{16}T^8 \\
&+ 119q^{15}T^9 - 2q^{16}T^7 + 223q^{15}T^8 - 15q^{14}T^9 + 25q^{15}T^7 - 178q^{14}T^8 + q^{13}T^9 \\
&- 115q^{14}T^7 + 35q^{13}T^8 - 2q^{14}T^6 + 176q^{13}T^7 + 8q^{12}T^8 + 29q^{13}T^6 - 89q^{12}T^7 \\
&- q^{11}T^8 - 98q^{12}T^6 + 6q^{11}T^7 - 3q^{12}T^5 + 103q^{11}T^6 - 2q^{10}T^7 + 32q^{11}T^5 - 24q^{10}T^6
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+ 2q^9T^7 - 73q^{10}T^5 - 7q^9T^6 - 4q^{10}T^4 + 46q^9T^5 - 2q^8T^6 + 26q^9T^4 + 12q^8T^5 + q^7T^6 \\
&- 41q^8T^4 - 14q^7T^5 - 3q^8T^3 + 5q^7T^4 + 4q^6T^5 + 14q^7T^3 + 14q^6T^4 - q^5T^5 \\
&- 9q^6T^3 - 2q^6T^2 - 12q^5T^3 - q^4T^4 + 6q^5T^2 + 3q^4T^3 + 5q^4T^2 + 3q^3T^3 - q^4T \\
&- 6q^3T^2 - q^2T^3 - 2q^3T - 2q^2T^2 + 8q^2T + qT^2 - q^2 - 4qT + T\big) \\
&/\big(q^2(1-q^{10}T^5)(1-q^8T^4)(1-q^5T^3)(1-q^4T^2)^2(1-q^3T^2)(1-q^2T)(1-qT)^2\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\mathsf{Z}_M(T) = 1 + (2q^2 + 4q + 4q^{-1} - q^{-2} - 8)T + \mathcal{O}(T^2)$, we see that, in contrast to O-maximal or K-minimal cases (see §5–6), the complexity of $\mathrm{ask}(M_1 \mid V_1)$ is in general a poor indicator of that of $\mathsf{Z}_M(T)$.

We note that by Corollary 7.13 and since $\mathsf{Z}_M(T) \notin \mathbf{Z}[\![T]\!]$, the module M cannot be a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{n}_6(\mathfrak{O})$. Indeed, this is readily verified directly even though M is listed as a Lie algebras in [55, Table 5].

Rojas's article [55] provides numerous examples of Lie subalgebras $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{n}_d(\mathbf{Z})$, say, for $d \leqslant 6$. For many of these, we may use `Zeta` to compute $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{g}\otimes_{\mathbf{Z}}\mathbf{Z}_p}(T)$. Here, we only include one example.

Example 8.4. Let $p \neq 2$ and let

$$
\mathfrak{g} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x_1 & \frac{x_2}{2} & -\frac{x_3}{2} & x_5 \\ 0 & 0 & x_1 & 0 & x_4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : x_1, \ldots, x_5 \in \mathfrak{O} \right\}.
$$

Then $\mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{n}_5(\mathfrak{O})$ of nilpotency class 4, listed as $L_{5,6}$ (de Graaf's [15] notation) in [55, Table 3]. For sufficiently large p,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Z}_{\mathfrak{g}}(T) = (\ &+ q^8T^7 - 3q^8T^6 + q^8T^5 + q^7T^6 + 2q^7T^5 - 2q^6T^5 - 2q^6T^4 - q^5T^5 + 6q^5T^4 \\
&- 3q^4T^4 - 3q^4T^3 + 6q^3T^3 - q^3T^2 - 2q^2T^3 - 2q^2T^2 + 2qT^2 + qT + T^2 \\
&- 3T + 1)/((1-q^5T^3)(1-q^4T^2)(1-q^2T)(1-qT)^2).
\end{aligned}
$$

Numerous examples (including the case of $\mathrm{M}_{d\times e}(\mathfrak{O})$) show that $\zeta_M(s)$ may have a pole at zero and Example 8.1 shows that negative poles can arise even for modules of square matrices. In contrast, all of the author's computations are consistent with the following question having a positive answer.

Question 8.5. *Let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$. Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{n}_d(\mathfrak{o})$ be a Lie subalgebra. Is it the case that for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$, every real pole of $\zeta_{\mathfrak{g}_v}(s)$ is positive?*

Supposing that Question 8.5 indeed has a positive answer, if $\mathbf{G} \leqslant \mathrm{U}_d \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} k$ is an algebraic group over k with associated $\mathfrak{o}$-form $\mathsf{G} \leqslant \mathrm{U}_d \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathfrak{o}$ (see Corollary 7.15), then we may evaluate the meromorphic continuation of $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{oc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{o}_v)}(q^{-s})$ at $s = 0$ for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$. It would then be interesting to see if one can interpret the resulting rational numbers, say in terms of properties of the orbit space $\mathfrak{o}_v^d/\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{o}_v)$.

8.3 Examples of conjugacy class zeta functions

Let k be a number field with ring of integers $\mathfrak{o}$. Morozov [52] classified nilpotent Lie algebras of dimension at most 6 over an arbitrary field of characteristic zero—equivalently, he classified unipotent algebraic groups of dimension at most 6 over these fields. A recent computer-assisted version of this classification (valid for fields of characteristic $\neq 2$) is due to de Graaf [15]. We use his notation and let $L_{d,i}$ (or $L_{d,i}(a)$) denote the ith Lie k-algebra (with parameter a) given in [15, §4].

Table 1 provides a complete list of "generic conjugacy class zeta function" associated with nilpotent Lie k-algebras of dimension at most 5 in the following sense: for each such algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, let $\mathbf{G}$ be its associated unipotent algebraic group over k. After choosing an embedding $\mathbf{G} \leqslant \mathrm{U}_d \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} k$, we obtain an $\mathfrak{o}$-form G of $\mathbf{G}$ as in Corollary 7.15. Then for almost all $v \in \mathcal{V}_k$ and all finite extensions K/k_v, $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$ is given in Table 1.

In contrast to dimension at most 5, Zeta is unable to compute generic conjugacy class zeta functions associated with every nilpotent Lie k-algebra of dimension 6. Nevertheless, Table 2 contains numerous examples of such functions; we only included examples corresponding to $\oplus$-indecomposable algebras. Clearly, generic conjugacy class zeta functions of direct products of algebraic groups are Hadamard products of the zeta functions corresponding to the factors.

We note that $L_{3,2} \approx \mathfrak{n}_3(K)$ and $L_{6,19}(-1) \approx \mathfrak{n}_4(K)$; an incorrect formula for $\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathrm{U}_3(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$ was given in [5, §8.2].

$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{O}))}(T)$
$L_{1,1}$	$1/(1-qT)$
$L_{2,1}$	$1/(1-q^2T)$
$L_{3,1}$	$1/(1-q^3T)$
$L_{3,2}$	$(1-T)/((1-q^2T)(1-qT))$
$L_{4,1}$	$1/(1-q^4T)$
$L_{4,2}$	$(1-qT)/((1-q^3T)(1-q^2T))$
$L_{4,3}$	$(1-T)/(1-q^2T)^2$
$L_{5,1}$	$1/(1-q^5T)$
$L_{5,2}$	$(1-q^2T)/((1-q^4T)(1-q^3T))$
$L_{5,3}$	$(1-qT)/(1-q^3T)^2$
$L_{5,4}$	$(1-T)/((1-q^4T)(1-qT))$
$L_{5,5}$	$\frac{1-T-qT+q^2T+q^2T^2-q^3T^2-q^4T^2+q^4T^3}{(1-q^5T^2)(1-q^3T)(1-qT)}$
$L_{5,6}$	$\frac{1-2T+qT^2+q^2T-2q^3T^2+q^3T^3}{(1-q^5T^2)(1-q^2T)(1-qT)}$
$L_{5,7}$	$(1-T)/((1-q^3T)(1-q^2T))$
$L_{5,8}$	$(1-qT)/(1-q^3T)^2$
$L_{5,9}$	$(1-T)/((1-q^3T)(1-q^2T))$

Table 1: Complete list of generic conjugacy class zeta functions of unipotent algebraic groups of dimension at most 5

$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathsf{Z}^{\mathsf{cc}}_{\mathsf{G}(\mathfrak{O})}(T)$
$L_{6,10}$, $L_{6,25}$, $L_{6,26}$	$(1-qT)/((1-q^4T)(1-q^3T))$
$L_{6,11}$, $L_{6,12}$, $L_{6,20}$	$\frac{1-2qT+q^2T+q^4T^2-2q^5T^2+q^6T^3}{(1-q^6T^2)(1-q^3T)^2}$
$L_{6,16}$	$(1-qT)(1-T)/((1-q^2T)^2(1-q^3T))$
$L_{6,17}$	$\frac{1-T-qT+q^2T+q^3T^2-q^4T^2-q^5T^2+q^5T^3}{(1-q^6T^2)(1-q^3T)(1-q^2T)}$
$L_{6,18}$	$(1-T)/((1-q^2T)(1-q^4T))$
$L_{6,19}(0)$	$\frac{1+T-3qT-q^2T+q^3T^2+3q^4T^2-q^5T^2-q^5T^3}{(1-q^3T)^3(1-q^2T)}$
$L_{6,19}(-1)$, $L_{6,21}(0)$	$(1-qT)^2/((1-q^3T)^2(1-q^2T))$
$L_{6,21}(1)$	$\frac{1-T-qT+q^2T+q^2T^2-q^3T^2-q^4T^2+q^4T^3}{(1-q^5T^2)(1-q^3T)(1-q^2T)}$
$L_{6,22}(0)$	$\frac{1-qT-q^2T+q^3T+q^4T^2-q^5T^2-q^6T^2+q^7T^3}{(1-q^7T^2)(1-q^4T)(1-q^2T)}$
$L_{6,23}$, $L_{6,24}(0)$	$\frac{1-2qT+q^3T+q^3T^2-2q^5T^2+q^6T^3}{(1-q^7T^2)(1-q^3T)(1-q^2T)}$

Table 2: Examples of generic conjugacy class zeta functions in dimension 6

References

[1] N. Avni, B. Klopsch, U. Onn, and C. Voll, *Representation zeta functions of compact p-adic analytic groups and arithmetic groups*, Duke Math. J. **162** (2013), no. 1, 111–197.

[2] ———, *Similarity classes of integral p-adic matrices and representation zeta functions of groups of type A_2*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **112** (2016), no. 2, 267.

[3] G. V. Balakin, *The distribution of the rank of random matrices over a finite field*, Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen. **13** (1968), 631–641.

[4] L. B. Beasley, *Spaces of matrices of equal rank*, Linear Algebra Appl. **38** (1981), 227–237.

[5] M. N. Berman, J. Derakhshan, U. Onn, and P. Paajanen, *Uniform cell decomposition with applications to Chevalley groups*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **87** (2013), no. 2, 586–606.

[6] J. Blömer, R. Karp, and E. Welzl, *The rank of sparse random matrices over finite fields*, Random Structures Algorithms **10** (1997), no. 4, 407–419.

[7] A. Boralevi, D. Faenzi, and E. Mezzetti, *Linear spaces of matrices of constant rank and instanton bundles*, Adv. Math. **248** (2013), 895–920.

[8] N. Boston and I. M. Isaacs, *Class numbers of p-groups of a given order*, J. Algebra **279** (2004), no. 2, 810–819.

[9] F. Brenti, *q-Eulerian polynomials arising from Coxeter groups*, European J. Combin. **15** (1994), no. 5, 417–441.

[10] F. Brenti and A. Carnevale, *Proof of a conjecture of Klopsch-Voll on Weyl groups of type A* (2017). To appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.

[11] A. Carnevale and C. Voll, *Orbit Dirichlet series and multiset permutations (preprint)* (2016). arXiv:1607.01292.

[12] H. Cohen, *Number theory. Vol. I. Tools and Diophantine equations*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 239, Springer, New York, 2007.

[13] C. Cooper, *On the distribution of rank of a random matrix over a finite field*, Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference "Random Structures and Algorithms" (Poznan, 1999), 2000, pp. 197–212.

[14] D. A. Cox, J. Little, and D. O'Shea, *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*, Fourth, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2015.

[15] W. A. de Graaf, *Classification of 6-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebras over fields of characteristic not 2*, J. Algebra **309** (2007), no. 2, 640–653.

[16] M. Demazure and P. Gabriel, *Groupes algébriques. Tome I: Géométrie algébrique, généralités, groupes commutatifs*, Masson & Cie, Éditeur, Paris; North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1970. Avec un appendice ıt Corps de classes local par Michiel Hazewinkel.

[17] J. Denef, *Report on Igusa's local zeta function*, Astérisque **201-203** (1991), Exp. No. 741, 359–386 (1992). Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 1990/91.

[18] J. Denef and D. Meuser, *A functional equation of Igusa's local zeta function*, Amer. J. Math. **113** (1991), no. 6, 1135–1152.

[19] J. D. Dixon, M. P. F. du Sautoy, A. Mann, and D. Segal, *Analytic pro-p groups*, Second, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 61, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[20] M. P. F. du Sautoy, *A nilpotent group and its elliptic curve: non-uniformity of local zeta functions of groups*, Israel J. Math. **126** (2001), 269–288.

[21] ———, *Counting subgroups in nilpotent groups and points on elliptic curves*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **549** (2002), 1–21.

[22] ———, *Counting conjugacy classes*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **37** (2005), no. 1, 37–44.

[23] M. P. F. du Sautoy and F. J. Grunewald, *Analytic properties of zeta functions and subgroup growth*, Ann. of Math. (2) **152** (2000), no. 3, 793–833.

[24] M. P. F. du Sautoy and M. Vaughan-Lee, *Non-PORC behaviour of a class of descendant p-groups*, J. Algebra **361** (2012), 287 –312.

[25] J.-G. Dumas, R. Gow, G. McGuire, and J. Sheekey, *Subspaces of matrices with special rank properties*, Linear Algebra Appl. **433** (2010), no. 1, 191–202.

[26] D. H. Dung and C. Voll, *Uniform analytic properties of representation zeta functions of finitely generated nilpotent groups* (2015). To appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. arXiv:1503.06947.

[27] S. N. Evans, *Elementary divisors and determinants of random matrices over a local field*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **102** (2002), no. 1, 89–102.

[28] J. Fulman and L. Goldstein, *Stein's method and the rank distribution of random matrices over finite fields*, Ann. Probab. **43** (2015), no. 3, 1274–1314.

[29] M. Giudici, M. W. Liebeck, C. E. Praeger, J. Saxl, and P. H. Tiep, *Arithmetic results on orbits of linear groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **368** (2016), no. 4, 2415–2467.

[30] J. González-Sánchez, *On p-saturable groups*, J. Algebra **315** (2007), no. 2, 809–823.

[31] J. González-Sánchez, *Kirillov's orbit method for p-groups and pro-p groups*, Comm. Algebra **37** (2009), no. 12, 4476–4488.

[32] S. M. Goodwin and G. Röhrle, *Calculating conjugacy classes in Sylow p-subgroups of finite Chevalley groups*, J. Algebra **321** (2009), no. 11, 3321–3334.

[33] ———, *On conjugacy of unipotent elements in finite groups of Lie type*, J. Group Theory **12** (2009), no. 2, 235–245.

[34] ———, *Rational points on generalized flag varieties and unipotent conjugacy in finite groups of Lie type*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), no. 1, 177–206.

[35] ———, *Counting conjugacy classes in the unipotent radical of parabolic subgroups of* $\mathrm{GL}_n(q)$, Pacific J. Math. **245** (2010), no. 1, 47–56.

[36] G. Higman, *Enumerating p-groups. I. Inequalities*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **10** (1960), 24–30.

[37] E. Hrushovski, B. Martin, S. Rideau, and R. Cluckers, *Definable equivalence relations and zeta functions of groups (preprint)* (2015). arXiv:0701011.

[38] J. ichi Igusa, *An introduction to the theory of local zeta functions*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 14, Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2000.

[39] I. Ilani, *Zeta functions related to the group* $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$, Israel J. Math. **109** (1999), 157–172.

[40] I. M. Isaacs, *Characters of groups associated with finite algebras*, J. Algebra **177** (1995), no. 3, 708–730.

[41] ———, *Counting characters of upper triangular groups*, J. Algebra **315** (2007), no. 2, 698–719.

[42] A. Jaikin-Zapirain, *Zeta function of representations of compact p-adic analytic groups*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **19** (2006), no. 1, 91–118 (electronic).

[43] I. Kaplansky, *Elementary divisors and modules*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **66** (1949), 464–491.

[44] B. Klopsch, *On the Lie theory of p-adic analytic groups*, Math. Z. **249** (2005), no. 4, 713–730.

[45] ———, *Representation growth and representation zeta functions of groups*, Note Mat. **33** (2013), no. 1, 107–120.

[46] V. F. Kolchin, *Random graphs*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 53, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[47] G. Landsberg, *Ueber eine Anzahlbestimmung und eine damit zusammenhängende Reihe*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **111** (1893), 87–88.

[48] M. Lazard, *Groupes analytiques p-adiques*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **26** (1965), 389–603.

[49] X. Li, W. H. Mow, and F.-L. Tsang, *Rank distribution analysis for sparse random linear network coding*, International Symposium on Network Coding (NetCod), 2011, pp. 1–6.

[50] N. Linial and D. Weitz, *Random vectors of bounded weight and their linear dependencies (unpublished manuscript)* (2010). `http://dimacs.rutgers.edu/~dror/pubs/rand_mat.pdf`.

[51] S. R. Lockard, *Random vectors over finite fields*, Ph.D. Thesis, 2007. `http://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_dissertations/54`.

[52] V. V. Morozov, *Classification of nilpotent Lie algebras of sixth order*, Izv. Vysš. Učebn. Zaved. Matematika **1958** (1958), no. 4 (5), 161–171.

[53] E. A. O'Brien and C. Voll, *Enumerating classes and characters of p-groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 11, 7775–7796.

[54] I. Pak and A. Soffer, *On Higman's* $k(U_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ *conjecture (preprint)* (2015). arXiv:1507.00411.

[55] N. Rojas, *Minimal representations for 6-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebra*, Linear Algebra Appl. **15** (2016), no. 10, 19 pages.

[56] T. Rossmann, *Stability results for local zeta functions of groups and related structures (preprint)* (2015). arXiv:1504.04164.

[57] ———, *A framework for computing zeta functions of groups, algebras, and modules (preprint)* (2016). `http://www.math.uni-bielefeld.de/~rossmann/files/1489.pdf`.

[58] ———, *Topological representation zeta functions of unipotent groups*, J. Algebra (2016). doi:10.1016/j.jalgebra.2015.09.050.

[59] ———, `Zeta`*, version 0.3.2*, 2016. See `http://www.math.uni-bielefeld.de/~rossmann/Zeta/`.

[60] R. P. Stanley, *Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 1*, Second, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 49, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.

[61] A. Stasinski and C. Voll, *Representation zeta functions of nilpotent groups and generating functions for Weyl groups of type B*, Amer. J. Math. **136** (2014), no. 2, 501–550.

[62] W. A. Stein et al., *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 7.4)*, The Sage Development Team, 2016. Available from `http://www.sagemath.org/`.

[63] C. Studholme and I. F. Blake, *Random matrices and codes for the erasure channel*, Algorithmica **56** (2010), no. 4, 605–620.

[64] J. Sylvester, *On the dimension of spaces of linear transformations satisfying rank conditions*, Linear Algebra Appl. **78** (1986), 1–10.

[65] A. Vera-López and J. M. Arregi, *Conjugacy classes in unitriangular matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl. **370** (2003), 85–124.

[66] W. Veys and W. A. Zúñiga-Galindo, *Zeta functions for analytic mappings, log-principalization of ideals, and Newton polyhedra*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360** (2008), no. 4, 2205–2227.

[67] C. Voll, *Functional equations for zeta functions of groups and rings*, Ann. of Math. (2) **172** (2010), no. 2, 1181–1218.

[68] ———, *A newcomer's guide to zeta functions of groups and rings*, Lectures on profinite topics in group theory, 2011, pp. 99–144.

[69] ———, *Zeta functions of groups and rings—recent developments*, Groups St Andrews 2013, 2015, pp. 469–492.

[70] R. Westwick, *Spaces of matrices of fixed rank*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra **20** (1987), no. 2, 171–174.